arXiv:1702.05113v1 [math.ST] 16 Feb 2017

Spatial Adaptation in Trend Filtering

Adityanand Guntuboyina*, Donovan Lieu, Sabyasachi Chatterjee, and Bodhisattva Sen†

423 Evans Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720
e-mail: aditya@stat.berkeley.edu

367 Evans Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720
e-mail: dlieu333@berkeley.edu

5734 S. University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
e-mail: sabyasachi@galton.uchicago.edu

1255 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, NY 10027
e-mail: bodhi@stat.columbia.edu

Abstract: We study trend filtering, a relatively recent method for univariate nonparametric regression. For a given integer $r \geq 1$, the r^{th} order trend filtering estimator is defined as the minimizer of the sum of squared errors when we constrain (or penalize) the sum of the absolute r^{th} order discrete derivatives over the input points. For $r = 1$, the estimator reduces to total variation regularization which has received much attention in the statistics and image processing literature. In this paper, we study the performance of the trend filtering estimator for every $r \geq 1$, both in the constrained and penalized forms. Our main results show that the estimator is *optimally spatially adaptive*. Specifically, we prove that, in spite of being a nonparametric estimator, when the underlying function is a (discrete) spline with few "knots", the risk (under the global squared error loss) of the trend filtering estimator (with an appropriate choice of the tuning parameter) achieves the *parametric* n^{-1}-rate, up to a logarithmic (multiplicative) factor. Our results also include high probability statements on the loss and are stated in sharp oracle form, i.e., our results apply to misspecification and have leading constant one for the misspecified term. Moreover, some of the metric entropy results used in this paper, derived using connections to fat shattering, are of independent interest.

Keywords and phrases: Adaptive splines, discrete splines, fat shattering, higher order total variation regularization, metric entropy bounds, nonparametric function estimation, risk bounds, subdifferential, tangent cone.

*Supported by NSF Grant DMS-1309356
†Supported by NSF Grant DMS-1150435

1. Introduction

Consider the nonparametric regression problem where we observe data generated according to the model:

$$Y_i = f^*(i/n) + \xi_i, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1}$$

where $f^* : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is the unknown regression function, and $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ are unobserved independent errors having the normal distribution with mean zero and variance σ^2. The goal is to recover the underlying function f^* from measurements $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. Alternatively, in the Gaussian sequence formulation, (1) can be expressed as

$$Y = \theta^* + \xi, \tag{2}$$

where $\xi \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$, and $\theta^* := (f^*(1/n), f^*(2/n), \ldots, f^*(1))$ is unknown. Here $N_n(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$ denotes the multivariate normal distribution with mean vector zero and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_n$.

In this paper, we study the performance of *trend filtering*, a relatively new method for nonparametric regression with special emphasis on its *spatial adaptation* properties. For a given integer $r \geq 1$, the r^{th} order trend filtering estimator is defined as the minimizer of the sum of squared errors when we constrain or penalize the sum of the absolute r^{th} order discrete derivatives over the input points. Formally, given a fixed integer $r \geq 1$ and a tuning parameter $V \geq 0$, the r^{th} order trend filtering estimator for θ^* in the constrained form is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} := \operatorname*{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\|Y - \theta\|^2 : \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \leq V n^{1-r} \right\} \tag{3}$$

where $V > 0$ is a tuning parameter (the multiplicative factor n^{1-r} is just for normalization), $D^{(0)}\theta := \theta$, $D^{(1)}\theta := (\theta_2 - \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n - \theta_{n-1})$ and $D^{(r)}\theta$, for $r \geq 2$, is recursively defined as $D^{(r)}\theta := D^{(1)}(D^{(r-1)}\theta)$. Also $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the usual L^1 norm defined by $\|x\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|$ for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Note that $\|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ also equals $V(D^{(r-1)}\theta)$ where $V(\alpha) := \sum_{i=2}^k |\alpha_i - \alpha_{i-1}|$ denotes the variation of a vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. For simplicity, we denote the operator $D^{(1)}$ by simply D.

Alternatively, the trend filtering estimator in the penalized form is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)} := \operatorname*{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|Y - \theta\|^2 + \sigma n^{r-1} \lambda \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \right) \tag{4}$$

for $r \geq 1$ and tuning parameter $\lambda \geq 0$. There is an abuse of notation here in that we are using the same notation for both the constrained and the penalized estimators. It may be noted, however, that when the subscript of $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}$ is V, we are referring to the constrained estimator (3) while when the subscript is λ, we are referring to the penalized estimator (4).

For $r = 1$, (4) reduces to the one-dimensional discrete version of total variation regularization which was first proposed by Rudin et al. [32] and has since been heavily used

in the image processing community. The penalized estimator (4), for general $r \geq 1$, was first proposed by Steidl et al. [34] in the image processing literature who termed it *higher order total variation regularization*. The same estimator was later rediscovered by Kim et al. [19] who coined the name *trend filtering* for it. Many properties of the estimator have been studied in Tibshirani [35]. It should also be mentioned here that a continuous version of (4), where the discrete differences are replaced by continuous derivatives, was proposed much earlier in the statistics literature by Mammen and van de Geer [25] under the name *locally adaptive regression splines*.

The presence of the L^1 norm in the constraint in (3) (resp. penalty in (4)) ensures sparsity of the vector $D^{(r)}\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ (resp. $D^{(r)}\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}$). This sparsity, in turn, implies that the vector $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ (resp. $\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}$) is given by $(f(1/n), \ldots, f(n/n))$ for a function f that is a *discrete spline* of degree $r-1$ (see e.g., Steidl et al. [34]). Discrete splines are piecewise polynomials with regularity at the knots. They differ from the usual (continuous) splines in the form of the regularity condition at the knots: for splines, the regularity condition translates to derivatives of adjacent polynomials agreeing at the knots while for discrete splines, the regularity condition translates to discrete differences of adjacent polynomials agreeing at the knots; see Mangasarian and Schumaker [26] for details. We also refer the reader to Tibshirani [35] and Wang et al. [39] for detailed studies of the properties of trend filtering estimators including continuous time representations.

The use of the trend filtering estimators in practical applications mainly stems from the fact that they present a way of fitting (discrete) splines to data where the knots are chosen automatically and without any input from the user (except for the value of the tuning parameter V or λ). Because of the automatic selection of the knots, trend filtering can be regarded as a spatially adaptive method. Note that such spatial adaptation is not exhibited by the (well-known) classical nonparametric regression methods such as local polynomials, kernels and splines, with a fixed tuning parameter. It is therefore natural to ask if trend filtering has any optimality properties as a spatially adaptive technique. The goal of this paper is to perform a theoretical study of the spatial adaptation properties of trend filtering.

We would like to mention here that theoretical analysis of spatially adaptive nonparametric regression methods is hard. Indeed there have been many spatially adaptive estimators proposed in the statistical literature in the last 30 years (and more), including CART (Breiman et al. [3]), MARS (Friedman [11]), variable-bandwidth kernel/spline methods (see e.g., Brockmann et al. [4], Müller and Stadtmüller [27], Pintore et al. [29] and Zhou and Shen [40]) and wavelets (Donoho and Johnstone [8]). However, as far as we are aware, only a few results exist that rigorously establish the optimality of these spatially adaptive estimators; notable exceptions include wavelets (see e.g., Donoho and Johnstone [8]) and variable-bandwidth kernel methods (see e.g., Lepski et al. [22] and Goldenshluger and Nemirovski [13]). Moreover, the analysis of trend filtering estimators is more involved compared to estimators based on wavelets and variable-bandwidth kernels because the trend filtering estimators are given by the output of an optimization algorithm and have no closed form expressions.

Borrowing from the framework of Donoho and Johnstone [8], we study optimality of trend filtering under the usual squared error loss and prove that trend filtering is optimally spatially adaptive when estimating (discrete) splines. The risk of an estimator $\hat{\theta}$ for θ^* under the squared error loss function is defined by

$$R(\hat{\theta}, \theta^*) := \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\theta^*}\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We shall provide upper bounds on the risks $R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*)$ and $R(\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}, \theta^*)$ as well as high probability upper bounds on the random loss functions $\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2/n$ and $\|\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2/n$.

Suppose that the true vector θ^* has the property that the vector $D^{(r)}\theta^*$ has k non-zero entries, i.e., $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_0 = k$ (formally $\|x\|_0$ is defined as the number of entries of the vector x that are non-zero). It then follows that θ^* is given by a piecewise polynomial made of $k+1$ polynomials each of degree $(r-1)$. Given data $Y \sim N_n(\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_n)$, an ideal (oracle) spatial method would put knots corresponding to θ^* and then fit a polynomial of degree $(r-1)$ in each of the partitions given by the knots. Such an ideal estimator will have risk (under the squared error loss function) bounded by $K_r\sigma^2(k+1)/n$ for a constant K_r depending only on r. This motivates the following question which is the focus of this paper: When $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_0 = k$, how do the risks of the trend filtering estimators $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ and $\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}$ compare with the oracle risk of $\sigma^2(k+1)/n$?

The main results of this paper for constrained trend filtering estimators (Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.4) imply that when $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_0 = k$, the risk of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ satisfies

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq C_r(c)\sigma^2 \frac{k+1}{n} \log \frac{en}{k+1},$$

provided

(i) the tuning parameter V is chosen to be close to $V^* := n^{r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1$, and

(ii) each of the polynomial pieces of θ^* have length bounded below by $cn/(k+1)$ for a positive constant c (in fact, our result requires a weaker version of this condition; see (12) and Remark 2.2).

Here $C_r(c)$ is a positive constant that depends only on r and the constant c from the second assumption above.

The implication of this result is that, under the natural *minimum length condition* on θ^* described in the second assumption above, if the tuning parameter V is properly chosen, the constrained trend filtering estimator has risk that is suboptimal only by a factor $\log(en/(k+1))$ compared to the oracle risk (ignoring multiplicative constants). Further, minimax results suggest that this additional logarithmic factor cannot be removed; see e.g., [18, Chapter 13]. This demonstrates that trend filtering is *optimally* spatially adapting to discrete splines. We shall also argue that the minimum length condition cannot be completely removed. This idea of using oracle risks to prove spatial adaptation goes

back to Donoho and Johnstone [8] who used it to establish spatial adaptation of wavelet shrinkage methods to piecewise polynomials. Our results are actually stronger compared to the adaptation results of Donoho and Johnstone [8] for the case of wavelets; the risk bounds in Donoho and Johnstone [8] had additional logarithmic factors.

We also prove results for the penalized trend filtering estimators. Here we prove (see Theorem 2.5) that, for $r = 1$, when $\|D^{(1)}\theta^*\|_0 = k$, the risk of $\hat{\theta}^{(1)}_\lambda$ is bounded from above by $C(c)\sigma^2 \frac{k+1}{n} \log \frac{en}{k+1}$ provided the minimum length condition holds and the tuning parameter λ is chosen appropriately. For $r \geq 2$, we prove in Theorem 2.6 that, when $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_0 = k$, the risk of $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda$ is bounded from above by $C_r(c)\sigma^2 \frac{(k+1)}{n} \log \frac{en}{k+1} + C_r(c)\sigma^2 \frac{(k+1)^{2r}}{n}$ under the same conditions (optimal choice of λ and the minimum length condition) as before.

We would like to mention here that our results also include high probability statements on the loss $\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_V - \theta^*\|^2/n$ (or $\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda - \theta^*\|^2/n$) in addition to risk bounds. We also state all our results in sharp oracle form, i.e., our results apply to misspecification and have leading constant one for the misspecified term (see Bellec [2] for background on sharp oracle inequalities under misspecification).

All previous adaptation results for trend filtering only applied to the case $r = 1$ (total variation regularization) and to the best of our knowledge, our result is the first to deal with arbitrary $r \geq 1$. In fact, even for $r = 2$ such adaptation results "are not currently available" although conjectures do; see Remark 21 of Lin et al. [24]. Furthermore, for $r = 1$, previous results, which dealt only with the penalized form of the estimator as opposed to the constrained form (Dalalyan et al. [6], Lin et al. [24]) had additional factors involving n and k in their risk bounds; see Remark 2.4 in Section 2 for a precise comparison of our result with existing ones. Our rationale for also studying the constrained form of the estimator is that the constrained estimator has smaller risk compared to the penalized estimator in some situations. For example, the following result (due to Oymak and Hassibi [28]) states that for every θ^*,

$$\lim_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \inf_V R(\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_V, \theta^*) \leq \lim_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \inf_\lambda R(\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda, \theta^*). \tag{5}$$

The above result shows that, in the low σ limit, the ideal constrained estimator has smaller risk and hence is a better estimator compared to the ideal penalized estimator.

We would like to mention here that there exists another strand of theoretical optimality results for trend filtering (established in Mammen and van de Geer [25] and Tibshirani [35]) which prove that the risk of the penalized trend filtering estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $n^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ for an appropriate choice of λ under a boundedness condition on $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1$. These results are often referred to as *slow rates* because they are slower than the parametric rate n^{-1} (even though they are still minimax under the assumed condition on θ^*). In this paper, we also provide a version of these results for the constrained trend filtering estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_V$ (see Theorem 2.1). It should be observed that these slow-rate results do not imply spatial adaptation because they do not use any sparsity constraint on $D^{(r)}\theta^*$.

Let us now briefly describe the techniques and ideas underlying the proofs of the results in the paper. For studying the constrained trend filtering estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$, we follow general results on the accuracy of constrained least squares estimators, see e.g., Bellec [2], Oymak and Hassibi [28], according to which risk bounds of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ can be obtained by controlling the *Gaussian width* of the *tangent cone* of the convex set

$$K^{(r)}(V) := \left\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \leq V n^{1-r}\right\} \tag{6}$$

at θ^*. The notion of tangent cones is recalled in (37). Also for a set $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we refer to $\mathbb{E}\sup_{\alpha \in T:\|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle$ as the Gaussian width of T where $Z \sim N_n(0, I_n)$ is a standard n-dimensional Gaussian vector. We shall alternatively refer to the Gaussian width of T as the expected Gaussian supremum taken over the set T.

We provide a precise characterization of the tangent cones of $K^{(r)}(V)$ in Lemma 4.1. These tangent cones have a complicated structure (especially for $r \geq 2$) that makes calculating their Gaussian widths non-trivial. Our idea behind these calculations is the observation that, under a unit norm constraint, every vector α belonging to the tangent cone of $K^{(r)}(V)$ at θ^* is nearly made up of two $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex/concave sequences in each polynomial part of θ^*; as proved in our Lemma 3.2. A sequence $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex/concave if the vector $D^{(r-1)}\theta$ is monotone (see Kuczma [20]). This observation allows us to compute the expected Gaussian suprema over these tangent cones using metric entropy results (which we establish via connections between metric entropy and fat shattering; Rudelson and Vershynin [31]) and also available results (from Bellec [2]) on the Gaussian widths of shape constrained cones. Note that the set of all $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex sequences in $\mathbb{R}^n$ forms a convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and these cones have been studied in the literature on shape constrained estimation. Our main expected Gaussian suprema result (Lemma 4.3) and our metric entropy results (stated in Subsection 4.4) are also of independent interest.

The results for the penalized estimator are based on a precise characterization of the subdifferential of the penalty function $\theta \mapsto \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ (see Proposition 4.4). This subdifferential is complicated especially for $r \geq 2$. However it turns out that the penalty function is such that it is possible to relate risk properties of the penalized estimator to the constrained estimator (we use ideas from Foygel and Mackey [10] for this) and thus we derive risk results for the penalized trend filtering estimator as a corollary to our results for the constrained estimator.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Our main results are described in Section 2: Subsection 2.1 deals with the constrained estimator while Subsection 2.2 is about the penalized estimator. The proofs for the main results are given in Section 3. Our proofs use several intermediate results about various things such as tangent cone characterizations of the constraint sets, Gaussian width calculations, subdifferential characterizations of the penalty functions and metric entropy results. Some of these intermediate results might themselves be of independent interest and we highlight these in Section 4. The paper has an Appendix which consists of two sections: Section A contains proofs of the key technical

supporting results of the paper and Section B contains additional technical results and proofs.

2. Main Results

Throughout C_r will denote a positive constant that depends on r alone although its precise value will change from equation to equation. We shall assume that $n \geq 2r$ throughout the paper (many of our results also hold under the weaker condition $n \geq r+1$). Also ξ will denote a vector having the $N_n(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$ distribution while Z will denote a vector having the $N_n(0, I_n)$ distribution.

2.1. Results for the Constrained Estimator

Let us start by stating our slow rate bound of $n^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ for risk of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ under the condition that the tuning parameter V satisfies $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1 \leq Vn^{1-r}$. This slow rate result is similar to results in Mammen and van de Geer [25] and Tibshirani [35]; the only difference being that our theorem below applies to the constrained form of trend filtering. We also explicitly write down the dependence of the bound on V and σ.

Theorem 2.1. *Fix $r \geq 1$. Suppose that the tuning parameter V is chosen so that $n^{r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1 \leq V$. Then there exists a positive constant C_r depending on r alone such that*

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq C_r \max\left(\left(\frac{\sigma^2 V^{1/r}}{n}\right)^{2r/(2r+1)}, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\log(en)\right). \tag{7}$$

Also for every $x > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r \max\left(\left(\frac{\sigma^2 V^{1/r}}{n}\right)^{2r/(2r+1)}, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\log(en)\right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{8}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Remark 2.1. *It is known that the rate $n^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ is the minimax rate of convergence over the class of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \leq Vn^{1-r}$ (see e.g., Donoho and Johnstone [7]). This means that the constrained trend filtering estimator with tuning parameter V is minimax optimal over $\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \leq Vn^{1-r}\}$. This result was known previously for the penalized estimator; see Tibshirani [35].*

Before we state our main spatial adaptation result, we need to introduce some notation. Fix an integer $r \geq 1$ and let $n \geq r+1$. For a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an index $2 \leq j \leq n-r+1$, we say that j is an r^{th} *order knot* (or *knot of order r*) of θ provided $(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{j-1} \neq (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_j$. Note that first order knots are just jumps and second order knots are points

of change of slope. We also say that an r^{th} order knot j has *sign* $+1$ if $(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{j-1} < (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_j$ and *sign* -1 if $(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{j-1} > (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_j$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let

$$\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V^{(r)}(\theta) := n^{r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1. \tag{9}$$

When $r = 1$, note that $V^{(1)}(\theta) = \|D\theta\|_1 = |\theta_2 - \theta_1| + \cdots + |\theta_n - \theta_{n-1}|$ which is simply the variation of θ. We therefore simply denote $V^{(1)}(\theta)$ by $V(\theta)$. It also follows then that $V^{(r)}(\theta) = n^{r-1}V(D^{(r-1)}\theta)$.

It may be observed that $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)$ equals precisely the number of r^{th} order knots of θ. Also, note that as $D^{(r)}\theta$ is a vector of length $n - r$, we necessarily have $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) = \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_0 \leq n - r \leq n - 1$.

Suppose $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) = k$ and let $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n - r + 1$ denote all the r^{th} order knots of θ with associated signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 1\}$. Also let $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. Further, let $n_0 := j_1 + r - 2$, $n_i := j_{i+1} - j_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ and $n_k := n - r + 2 - j_k$ and observe that $\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i = n$. Finally, let

$$n_{i*} := \min\left(n_i, \frac{n}{k+1}\right) \qquad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \ldots, k.$$

We now define two quantities $\delta_r(\theta)$ and $\Delta_r(\theta)$ in the following way:

$$\delta_r(\theta) := \left(n_{0*}^{1-2r} + n_{k*}^{1-2r} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n_{i*}^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}\right)^{1/2} \tag{10}$$

and

$$\Delta_r(\theta) := \frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1} + \frac{\delta_r^2(\theta)}{n}\left(\frac{n}{k+1}\right)^{2r-1}\log\frac{en}{k+1} + \left(\frac{\delta_r(\theta)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{1/r} \tag{11}$$

where, in the definition of $\delta_r(\theta)$, the quantity $I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}$ denotes the indicator variable that equals 1 if $\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$ and 0 if $\mathfrak{r}_i = \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$. Note that trivially $\Delta_r(\theta) \geq (k+1)/n \geq 1/n$.

Our results will show that the risk of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ for θ^* will essentially be controlled by $\Delta_r(\theta^*)$. The key point to note about $\Delta_r(\theta)$ is the fact (easy to check) that when

$$\min_{0 \leq i \leq k : \mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}} n_i \geq \frac{cn}{k+1} \tag{12}$$

for a positive constant $c \leq 1$ (here $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 1\}$ are the signs of the r^{th} order knots of θ while $\mathfrak{r}_0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{k+1}$ are taken to be zero), then

$$\delta_r^2(\theta) \leq \left(\frac{cn}{k+1}\right)^{1-2r}(k+1)$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_r(\theta) &\leq \left\{1 + c^{1-2r}\right\}\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1} + c^{(1-2r)/(2r)}\frac{k+1}{n} \\ &\leq \left\{1 + c^{1-2r} + c^{(1-2r)/(2r)}\right\}\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We say that θ satisfies the *minimum length condition* with constant c if condition (12) holds. We have just observed that when θ satisfies the minimum length condition with constant c then $\Delta_r(\theta) \leq C_r(c)\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1}$ for a constant $C_r(c)$ depending only on c and r.

The following is the main result of the paper for the constrained trend filtering estimator.

Theorem 2.2. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2r$. Consider the estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ defined in (3) with tuning parameter $V \geq 0$. Then for every $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V} \left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right) \tag{14}$$

for a positive constant C_r, depending only on r. Also for every $x > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V} \left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{15}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Theorem 2.2 applies to every $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and is stated in the sharp oracle form. It implies that the risk of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ for the truth θ^* is small provided there exists some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$ such that (a) $\|\theta - \theta^*\|$ is small, and (b) $\Delta_r(\theta)$ is small.

Theorem 2.2 gives the following corollary describes the performance of the best constrained trend filtering estimator (as opposed to the estimator for a fixed tuning parameter V) again in sharp oracle form.

Corollary 2.3. *For every $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$\inf_{V \geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right\} \tag{16}$$

and for every $x > 0$,

$$\inf_{V \geq 0} \frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{17}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Theorem 2.2 also yields the following corollary which is a non-oracle inequality and is more readily interpretable. Recall from (13) that $\Delta_r(\theta)$ is bounded from above by a constant multiple of $\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1}$ provided $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) = k$ and θ satisfies the minimum length condition (12).

Corollary 2.4. *Consider the estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ with tuning parameter V. Suppose θ^* satisfies the minimum length condition (12) with constant c, then*

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq \left(V - V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2 + C_r(c)\frac{\sigma^2\left(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*) + 1\right)}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*) + 1} \tag{18}$$

where $C_r(c)$ is a positive constant that depends on r and c alone. Also, for every $x > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \left(V - V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2 + C_r(c)\frac{\sigma^2\left(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1\right)}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1} + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{19}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Further, if V is chosen so that

$$\left(V - V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2 \leq C\frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1)}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1}$$

for a positive constant C, then we have

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq C_r(c, C)\frac{\sigma^2\left(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1\right)}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1} \tag{20}$$

for a positive constant $C_r(c, C)$ that depends on r, c and C alone and, for every $x > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r(c, C)\frac{\sigma^2\left(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1\right)}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1} + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{21}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Corollary 2.4 should be interpreted in the following way. Suppose $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*) = k$ so that θ^* is a discrete spline made of $k+1$ polynomial pieces with each polynomial being of degree $r-1$. An oracle piecewise polynomial estimator that knows where to put the knots based on θ^* would therefore achieve a risk of $C_r\sigma^2\frac{k+1}{n}$. Corollary 2.4 states that the trend filtering estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ achieves the same risk up to a multiplicative factor of $\log\frac{en}{k+1}$ provided (i) the tuning parameter V is chosen to be close to $V^{(r)}(\theta^*)$, and (ii) θ^* satisfies the minimum length condition (12) with some constant c.

We would like to emphasize here that Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.4 both apply to every $r \geq 1$. On the other hand, existing adaptation results for trend filtering all deal with the case $r = 1$ (which corresponds to total variation regularization). Even in the case when $r = 1$, our results are stronger compared to the existing results in the literature (see Remark 2.4 for a precise comparison).

Remark 2.2 (On the minimum length condition)**.** *We would like to remark here that the minimum length condition* (12) *required for Corollary 2.4 is weaker than existing minimum length conditions in the literature (this comparison is only for $r = 1$ because no results exist for $r \geq 2$) which are all of the form*

$$\min_{0\leq i\leq k} n_i \geq \frac{cn}{k+1} \qquad \text{where } k = \mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*). \tag{22}$$

Indeed our condition (12) *requires that $n_i \geq cn/(k+1)$ be true only for those i for which $\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$ while* (22) *requires this for all i. To see why our condition can be substantially*

weaker, consider, for example, the situation when θ^* is an $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex/concave sequence i.e., $D^{(r-1)}\theta^*$ is a monotonic vector (for $r = 1$, this means that θ^* is itself monotone while for $r = 2$, this means that θ^* is convex/concave). In this case, condition (12) *is equivalent to requiring that $n_i \geq cn/(k+1)$ only for $i = 0$ and $i = k$ which is much weaker than requiring it for all $0 \leq i \leq k$.*

Remark 2.3 (The minimum length condition cannot be removed)**.** *We shall argue here via simulations that the minimum length condition in Corollary 2.4 cannot be removed. Suppose that θ^* is given by*

$$\theta_1^* = \cdots = \theta_{n-1}^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_n^* = 5 \tag{23}$$

and consider estimating θ^* from an observation $Y \sim N_n(\theta^*, I_n)$ (i.e., $\sigma = 1$) by $\hat{\theta}_V^{(1)}$ (i.e., $r = 1$) with tuning parameter $V = V^{(1)}(\theta^*) = 5$. It is clear here that $\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*) = 1$. The minimum length condition (12) *is not satisfied because $n_0 = n - 1$ and $n_1 = 1$. The risk $R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(1)}, \theta^*)$ can be computed via simulation. In Figure 1 (left panel), we have plotted $\log R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(1)}, \theta^*)$ against $\log n$ for values of n between 1000 and 5000 (chosen to be equally spaced on the log-scale). For each value of n, we calculated the risk using 100 Monte Carlo replications. The slope of the least squares line through these points turned out to be close to $-2/3$ which indicates that the risk $R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(1)}, \theta^*)$ decays at the rate $n^{-2/3}$. This rate is slower than the rate given by Corollary 2.4 indicating that inequality* (18) *is not true for this θ^*. On the other hand, the $n^{-2/3}$ rate here makes sense in light of Theorem 2.1. Therefore, even though the vector $D\theta^*$ is sparse (with $\|D\theta^*\|_0 = 1$), the rate of convergence of $\hat{\theta}^{(1)}$ is equal to the slow rate $n^{-2/3}$ and not the fast rate given by Corollary 2.4. This points to the necessity of the minimum length condition* (12)*.*



Fig 1: Left: plot of $\log R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(1)}, \theta^*)$ against $\log n$ for θ^* as in (23). The least squares slope is close to $-2/3$ which suggests that the risk decays as $n^{-2/3}$ instead of the fast rate given by Corollary 2.4. Right: plot of $\log R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(2)}, \theta^*)$ against $\log n$ for θ^* defined in (24). The least squares slope is close to $-2/5$ which suggests that the risk decays as $n^{-2/5}$ instead of the fast rate given by Corollary 2.4.

Another counterexample for the necessity of (12) *for Corollary 2.4 is:*

$$\theta_1^* = \cdots = \theta_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}^* = \theta_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 2}^* = \cdots = \theta_n^* = 5. \tag{24}$$

Here consider the problem of estimating θ^* *by the estimator* $\hat{\theta}_V^{(2)}$ *(i.e.,* $r = 2$*) with tuning parameter* $V = V^{(2)}(\theta^*) = 10n$*. It is clear that* $\mathbf{k}_2(\theta^*) = 2$*,* $n_0 = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$*,* $n_1 = 1$ *and* $n_2 = n - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$*. The minimum length condition* (12) *is not satisfied because* n_1 *is too small. The risk* $\log R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(2)}, \theta^*)$ *is plotted against* $\log n$ *in the right panel of Figure 1 (the values of* n *are chosen as before). The slope of the least squares line here is close to* $-2/5$ *which suggests that the risk decays slowly than what is given by Corollary 2.4. Note here that* $n^{-2/5}$ *is exactly the rate (slow rate) given by Theorem 2.1 (take* $r = 2$ *and* $V = 10n$ *in* (7)*).*

2.2. Results for the Penalized Estimator

In this section, we present risk results for the penalized estimator $\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}$ defined in (4). We first consider the case where $r = 1$ which corresponds to one-dimensional total variation regularization and is the most studied estimator in the class $\{\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(r)}, r \geq 1\}$. Even though results exist for the risk of $\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)}$, it appears that the following result is stronger than all the existing risk results for $\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)}$ (see Remark 2.4 after the next theorem).

In the following theorem, $\Delta_1(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{k}_1(\theta)$ denote, respectively, the quantities $\Delta_r(\theta)$ (defined in (11)) and $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)$ (defined in (9)) for $r = 1$.

Theorem 2.5. *There exists a universal positive constant* C *such that*

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)}, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C\sigma^2 \Delta_1(\theta) \right). \tag{25}$$

Also, for every $x > 0$*,*

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C\sigma^2 \Delta_1(\theta) \right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{26}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$*.*

Further, if θ^* *satisfies the minimum length condition* (12) *with constant* c*, then*

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)}, \theta^*) \leq C(c)\sigma^2 \frac{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*) + 1}{n} \log \frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*) + 1} \tag{27}$$

for a constant $C(c)$ *depending on* c *alone. Also, for each* $x > 0$*,*

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\theta}_\lambda^{(1)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C(c)\sigma^2 \frac{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*) + 1}{n} \log \frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*) + 1} + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{28}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$*.*

Remark 2.4 (Comparison to existing results)**.** *Among the class of existing results for the risk of $\hat{\theta}^{(1)}_\lambda$, the strongest seems to be due to Lin et al. [24] who proved that when λ is appropriately selected (depending on θ^*), the estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(1)}_\lambda$ satisfies the risk bound*

$$R(\hat{\theta}^{(1)}_\lambda, \theta^*) \leq C\frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)+1)}{n}\left([\log(\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)+1)+\log\log n]\log n + \sqrt{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)+1}\right) \quad (29)$$

provided

$$\min_{0\leq i\leq k} n_i \geq \frac{cn}{\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)+1} \quad (30)$$

for a positive constant c. Here the integers $n_0, \ldots, n_k$ are the gaps between the jumps of θ^* (as defined between equations (9) *and* (10)*). This result from Lin et al. [24] improves earlier results due to Dalalyan et al. [6], Harchaoui and Lévy-Leduc [15], Lévy-Leduc and Harchaoui [23]. It is easy to see that the bound given by* (29) *is weaker than that given by* (27) *in two respects: (a) there are additional terms in* (29) *involving $\log n$ and $\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)$ compared to* (27)*, and (b) our minimum length condition* (12) *is weaker than* (30)*. Indeed our condition* (12) *requires that $n_i \geq cn/(\mathbf{k}_1(\theta^*)+1)$ only for those i for which $\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$ while* (30) *requires this for all i.*

We next state our risk result for $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda$ for $r \geq 2$. For $c > 0$, let $\mathcal{M}_r(c)$ denote the class of all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfy the minimum length condition (12) with constant c. Note that this class depends on r. Indeed, it is possible for a vector θ to satisfy (12) for some r but not for other values of r. For example, θ^* defined in (24) satisfies (12) for $r = 1$ but not for $r = 2$.

Theorem 2.6. *Fix $r \geq 2$. For every $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $c > 0$, we have*

$$\inf_{\lambda\geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta\in\mathcal{M}_r(c)}\left[\frac{\|\theta^*-\theta\|^2}{n} + C_r(c)\sigma^2\left(\frac{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1} + \frac{(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1)^{2r}}{n}\right)\right] \quad (31)$$

for a positive constant $C_r(c)$ that depends on r and c alone. Also, for every $x > 0$, we have

$$\inf_{\lambda\geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta\in\mathcal{M}_r(c)}\left[\frac{\|\theta^*-\theta\|^2}{n} + C_r(c)\sigma^2\left(\frac{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1} + \frac{(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)+1)^{2r}}{n}\right)\right] + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$.

Remark 2.5. *When θ^* satisfies the minimum length condition* (12) *with constant c i.e., if $\theta^* \in \mathcal{M}_r(c)$, then we can take $\theta = \theta^*$ in Theorem 2.6 to deduce that*

$$\inf_{\lambda\geq 0} R(\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_\lambda, \theta^*) \leq C_r(c)\sigma^2\left(\frac{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1} + \frac{(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1)^{2r}}{n}\right)$$

along with an analogous high probability statement.

It may be noted that the above result is weaker than our corresponding risk bound for the constrained trend filtering estimator (Corollary 2.4) because of the additional term involving $(\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)+1)^{2r}$. We believe that this term is redundant and is an artifact of our proof.

3. Proofs of the Main Results

3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.1

We prove Theorem 2.1 in this subsection. The estimator $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ is the least squares estimator subject to the constraint that $\theta \in K^{(r)}(V)$ (recall that the set $K^{(r)}(V)$ is defined in (6)). The general theory of such estimators has a long history and is, by now, well established (see e.g., Chatterjee [5], Hjort and Pollard [17], Van de Geer [36], Van der Vaart and Wellner [38]). This theory implies that one can bound the risk of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ based on accurate upper bounds for

$$G(t) := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta \in K^{(r)}(V): \|\theta - \theta^*\| \le t} \langle \xi, \theta - \theta^* \rangle\right] \tag{32}$$

for $t > 0$. We control $G(t)$ using the following lemma which is crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Fix an integer $r \ge 1$. Then there exists a positive constant C_r such that for every $n \ge r$, $t \ge 0$ and $V \ge 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n: \|\theta\| \le t, \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 \le V n^{1-r}} \langle \xi, \theta \rangle\right] \le C_r \sigma t \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} V}{t}\right)^{1/(2r)} + C_r \sigma t \sqrt{\log(en)}. \tag{33}$$

Lemma 3.1 is proved in Subsection A.2 and the ideas behind its proof are as follows. By Dudley's entropy bound, the left hand side of (33) can be bounded from above using bounds on the metric entropy numbers of the following subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (the ϵ-metric entropy number of a set, formally defined in Subsection 4.4, is the logarithm of the ϵ-covering number which is further defined as the smallest number of Euclidean balls of radius ϵ required to cover the set):

$$S_r(V, t) := \left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\alpha\| \le t, \|D^{(r)}\alpha\|_1 \le V n^{1-r}\right\}. \tag{34}$$

For bounding the metric entropy numbers of $S_r(V, t)$, our idea is to use existing connections between metric entropy and fat shattering dimension from Rudelson and Vershynin [31] (the definition of fat shattering dimension and its connections to metric entropy are described in Subsection 4.4). At a high level, we relate the class $S_r(V, t)$ to the classes of the form

$$\mathcal{C}_r(a, V) := \left\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : a \le (D^{r-1}\theta)_1 \le \cdots \le (D^{r-1}\theta)_{n-r+1} \le a + V\right\} \tag{35}$$

for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V \ge 0$. The fat shattering dimension of $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ can be controlled as in Lemma 4.7 which allows us to bound the metric entropy of suitable subsets of $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ via Rudelson and Vershynin [31, Corollary 6.4]. This allows us to deduce accurate upper bounds on the metric entropy of $S_r(V, t)$ which are described in Theorem 4.5.

Below, we provide the proof of Theorem 2.1 based on Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. As $\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1 \leq Vn^{1-r}$, it follows that $\theta^* \in K^{(r)}(V)$ (the set $K^{(r)}(V)$ is defined in (6)). Note also that $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ is the least squares estimator over $K^{(r)}(V)$. Our strategy for controlling the risk of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ is based on Chatterjee [5, Corollary 1.2] which says that

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq \frac{C}{n} \max\left(t_0^2, \sigma^2\right) \tag{36}$$

for a universal positive constant C, where $t_0 > 0$ is such that $G(t_0) \leq t_0^2/2$ with $G(t)$ defined as in (32). In order to apply this result, we need to bound the function $G(t)$ from above. By triangle inequality, $\|D^{(r)}(\theta - \theta^*)\|_1 \leq \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 + \|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1$ so that

$$G(t) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in K^{(r)}(V): \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq t} \langle \xi, \theta - \theta^* \rangle \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\alpha\| \leq t, \|D^{(r)}\alpha\|_1 \leq 2Vn^{1-r}} \langle \xi, \alpha \rangle .$$

The right hand side above is controlled in Lemma 3.1 from which we deduce that

$$G(t) \leq C_r \sigma t \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}V}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2r}} + C_r \sigma t \sqrt{\log(en)}$$

for a constant C_r depending on r alone. We now observe that

$$C_r \sigma t \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}V}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2r}} \leq \frac{t^2}{4} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad t \geq (4C_r)^{2r/(2r+1)} \sigma^{2r/(2r+1)} \left(V\sqrt{n}\right)^{1/(2r+1)}$$

and

$$C_r \sigma t \sqrt{\log(en)} \leq \frac{t^2}{4} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad t \geq 4C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log(en)}.$$

It follows therefore that $G(t_0) \leq t_0^2/2$ provided

$$t_0 := \max\left((4C_r)^{2r/(2r+1)} \sigma^{2r/(2r+1)} \left(V\sqrt{n}\right)^{1/(2r+1)}, 4C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log(en)}\right).$$

The proof of inequality (7) is therefore complete by inequality (36).

Inequality (8) can be derived as a consequence of (7) and the fact that the map $y \mapsto \|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|$ is 1-Lipschitz (see e.g., van de Geer and Wainwright [37, Section 2]). By the usual concentration inequality for Lipschitz functions of Gaussian variables, this gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\| \geq \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\| + \sigma z\right\} \leq \exp\left(\frac{-z^2}{2}\right).$$

This gives that

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq 2R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$ so that inequality (8) follows from (7). □

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.2

The proof of Theorem 2.2 will use available techniques connecting the risk of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ to expected Gaussian suprema over tangent cones to $K^{(r)}(V)$. Specifically, for $\theta \in K^{(r)}(V)$, let $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ denote the tangent cone to $K^{(r)}(V)$ at θ, defined by

$$T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) := \left\{u(\eta - \theta) : u \geq 0, \eta \in K^{(r)}(V)\right\}. \tag{37}$$

Then the following pair of results from Bellec [2, Corollary 2.2] connects the risk and loss of $\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}$ to expected Gaussian suprema taken over tangent cones to $K^{(r)}(V)$: For every $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$R(\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)}, \theta^*) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right)^2 \right\}$$

and, for every $x > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}_V^{(r)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2 + \frac{2\sigma^2}{n}\left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right)^2 \right\} + \frac{2\sigma^2}{n}(1+2x)$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$. In both the above inequalities, Z is an n-dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. From these results (and the trivial fact that $\Delta_r(\theta) \geq 1/n$ so that $1/n + C_r\Delta_r(\theta) \leq (1 + C_r)\Delta_r(\theta)$) , it is clear that for the proof of Theorem 2.2, it is enough to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right] \leq C_r\sqrt{n\Delta_r(\theta)} \qquad \text{for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } V^{(r)}(\theta) = V. \tag{38}$$

In order to prove the above inequality, we obviously need to understand the set $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. The following result provides a necessary condition that is satisfied by every vector $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ with $\|\alpha\| \leq 1$. This lemma is proved in Subsection A.1. Recall, from Section 2, the notion of r^{th} order knots (along with their signs) of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We shall also use the following notation. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $1 \leq a \leq b \leq m$, we let

$$V_{a,b}(\alpha) := V(\alpha_a, \ldots, \alpha_b) = |\alpha_{a+1} - \alpha_a| + \cdots + |\alpha_b - \alpha_{b-1}|. \tag{39}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Fix $V > 0$, $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. Suppose $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n - r + 1$ denote any set of indices which contains all the r^{th} order knots of θ. Let $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$ be such that $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is the sign of the knot corresponding to j_i if j_i is a knot and $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is arbitrary in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ if j_i is not a knot. Also let $j_0 = 1$, $j_{k+1} = n - r + 2$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. The indices $j_0, j_1, \ldots, j_k, j_{k+1}$ define a partition $\mathcal{I}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_k$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ in the following way: $\mathcal{I}_0 := \{j_0, \ldots, j_1 + r - 2\}$ and*

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \{j_i + r - 1, \ldots, j_{i+1} + r - 2\} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Let n_i denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{I}_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ i.e., $n_0 := j_1 + r - 2$ and $n_i = j_{i+1} - j_i$ for $1 \le i \le k$. Then there exists a positive constant C_r (that depends on r alone) such that for every $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ with $\|\alpha\| \le 1$, there exist indices $\ell_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0, \ell_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1, \ldots, \ell_k \in \mathcal{I}_k$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \le C_r \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}} \tag{40}$$

where

$$\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) := V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) - \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}(\Delta_{j_{i+1}-1} - \Delta_{\ell_i}) - \mathfrak{r}_i(\Delta_{\ell_i} - \Delta_{j_i}) \tag{41}$$

with $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{n-r+1}) := D^{(r-1)}\alpha$.

Remark 3.1. *It may be noted that the indices $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ in Lemma 3.2 are not exactly the knots of θ. They are any set of indices that contain the knots of θ. We shall mostly work with the case when $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ are exactly the set of knots of θ but we shall need this additional generality to deal with one special situation when some of the distances between the knots of θ are too large. In this case (see the last part of the proof of Theorem 2.2), we shall add additional indices to the knots in order to keep the inter-distances manageable.*

The proof of Lemma 3.2 is involved and is given in Subsection A.1. The insight provided by Lemma 3.2 into the structure of $\{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \le 1\}$ (note that understanding this set is necessary for proving (38)) is as follows. Suppose that $n_0, \ldots, n_k$ are such that the right hand side of (40) is small. In this case, Lemma 3.2 implies that for every $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ with $\|\alpha\| \le 1$, there exist indices $\ell_0, \ldots, \ell_k$ for which $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i)$ is small. It is helpful here to observe that $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i)$ is always nonnegative. Also, if $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) = 0$, then $D^{(r-1)}\alpha$ is made of two monotone pieces in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$ (one piece from j_i to ℓ_i and the other from ℓ_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$). When $r = 1$, this means that α is made of two monotone pieces in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$. When $r = 2$, this means that α is made of two convex/concave pieces in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$. For general r, this means that α is made of two $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex/concave functions in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$. Extending this argument, when $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i)$ is small, $D^{(r-1)}\alpha$ is *nearly* made of two monotone pieces in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$; equivalently α is nearly made of two $(r-1)^{th}$ order convex/concave sequences in the interval from j_i to $j_{i+1} - 1$. This suggests therefore that in order to prove (38), we need to prove bounds on the Gaussian suprema for vectors $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $D^{(r-1)}\alpha$ is nearly monotone. This is the content of the next lemma which is another main ingredient for the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $r \ge 1$, $n \ge r$, $1 \le l \le n - r + 1$, $t > 0$ and $\delta \ge 0$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\Delta(\theta) = (\Delta_1(\theta), \ldots, \Delta_{n-r+1}(\theta)) := D^{(r-1)}\theta$. Also let $\xi \sim N_n(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$. For every $\mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, the quantity*

$$G := \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup\big\{\, \langle \xi, \theta \rangle \;\; : \;\; \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\theta\| \le t, \text{ and } V(\Delta(\theta)) \le \mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell(\theta) - \Delta_1(\theta)) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1}(\theta) - \Delta_\ell(\theta)) + \delta\big\}\Big]$$

is bounded from above as

$$G \leq C_r \sigma \left(t + \delta n^{(2r-1)/2}\right) \sqrt{\log(en)} + C_r \sigma t^{(2r-1)/(2r)} n^{(2r-1)/(4r)} \delta^{1/(2r)}$$

for a positive constant C_r that depends on r alone.

The proof of Lemma 3.3 is given in Subsection A.2 (in fact, in Subsection A.2, we prove Lemma 4.3 which is a more accurate result compared to Lemma 3.3 in the sense that Lemma 4.3 gives a bound that depends on the actual values of $\mathfrak{r}_1$ and $\mathfrak{r}_2$). The proof of Lemma 4.3 uses results on expected Gaussian suprema for classes of shape-constrained vectors from Bellec [2].

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. As the proof is rather long, we divide it into many steps.

Step I: We first note that the case when $V = 0$ is trivial. This is because the set $\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 = 0\}$ is a subspace of dimension r so that $\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_{V=0}$ becomes a linear projection onto a subspace. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_{V=0} - \theta^*\|^2 - \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 = 0} \frac{1}{n}\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2 \sim \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\chi^2_r$$

where χ^2_r denotes the chi-squared distribution with r degrees of freedom. This and a standard tail bound for chi-squared random variables such as (see e.g., Laurent and Massart [21, Subsection 4.1])

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\chi^2_r \leq 2r + 4x\right\} \geq 1 - e^{-x} \qquad \text{for every } x > 0$$

proves Theorem 2.2 for $V = 0$; note that when $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V = 0$, we have $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) = 0$, $\delta_r(\theta) = n^{(1/2)-r}$ and $\Delta_r(\theta) = \frac{2}{n}\log(en) + \frac{1}{n}$.

We shall assume from now on that $V > 0$. Based on the discussion at the beginning of this subsection, it is enough to prove (38). We therefore fix $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. We need to bound the quantity

$$G := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right] \tag{42}$$

where Z is a standard n-dimensional Gaussian random vector. We bound G by breaking the set $\{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1\}$ into smaller subsets.

Let $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n - r + 1$ denote all the r^{th} order knots of θ. Also let $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 1\}$ denote the signs of the knots. For convenience, we take $j_0 = 1, j_{k+1} = n - r + 2$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. Let $n_0 = j_1 + r - 2$ and $n_u = j_{u+1} - j_u$ for $u = 1, \ldots, k$. Check that $\sum_{u=0}^{k} n_u = n$.

Step II: We shall prove (38) first under the simplifying assumption that

$$n_i \leq \frac{2n}{k+1} \qquad \text{for every } i = 0, 1, \ldots, k. \tag{43}$$

The goal of this step is to find a collection of sets whose union covers $\left\{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1\right\}$ (see (45)). For every vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let us define the vectors

$$\alpha^{(0)} := (\alpha_{j_0}, \ldots, \alpha_{j_1+r-2})$$

and

$$\alpha^{(u)} := (\alpha_{j_u+r-1}, \ldots, \alpha_{j_{u+1}+r-2}) \qquad \text{for } u = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Note that the vector $\alpha^{(u)}$ has length exactly equal to n_u for $u = 0, \ldots, k$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the class of all vectors $\mathbf{m} := (\mathbf{m}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_k)$ where each $\mathbf{m}_i$ is an integer with $1 \leq \mathbf{m}_i \leq k+1$ and such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathbf{m}_i \leq 2(k+1)$. Because the number of $(k+1)$-tuples of positive integers whose sum is equal to p equals $\binom{p-1}{k}$, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{M}$ is a finite set whose cardinality $|\mathcal{M}|$ can be bounded as

$$|\mathcal{M}| \leq \sum_{p=k}^{2k+1} \binom{2k+1}{p} \leq 2^{2k+1} \leq 4^{k+1}.$$

Also let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the class of all vectors $\ell := (\ell_0, \ldots, \ell_k)$ where each ℓ_i is an integer such that $j_0 \leq \ell_0 \leq j_1 - 1$ and $j_u + r - 1 \leq \ell_u \leq j_{u+1} - 1$ for $u = 1, \ldots, k$. The cardinality $|\mathcal{L}|$ of $\mathcal{L}$ is clearly bounded from above by $\prod_{u=0}^{k} n_u$.

Let

$$\delta := C_r \sqrt{n_0^{1-2r} + n_k^{1-2r} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n_i^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}}$$

where C_r is the constant given by Lemma 3.2. Note that

$$\delta \leq C_r \delta_r(\theta) \tag{44}$$

where $\delta_r(\theta)$ is as defined in (10). This is because $n_i \geq n_{i*}$ for every i and $1 - 2r < 0$.

Also for $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 \leq i \leq k$, let $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i)$ be defined (as in (41)) as

$$V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) - \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left\{(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_{i+1}-1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i}\right\} - \mathfrak{r}_i\left\{(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i}\right\}.$$

For every $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, let $T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ denote the set of all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\alpha\| \leq 1$ for which

$$\|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_i \delta}{k+1}$$

for every $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. We then claim that

$$\left\{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}} T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell). \tag{45}$$

To see (45), note first that it follows from Lemma 3.2 that for every $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ with $\|\alpha\| \leq 1$, there exists $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \delta$. This implies that for every $0 \leq i \leq k$, the inequality $0 \leq \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \delta$ and so there exists an integer $1 \leq \mathbf{q}_i \leq k+1$ such that

$$\frac{(\mathbf{q}_i - 1)\delta}{k+1} \leq \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_i \delta}{k+1}.$$

The integers $\mathbf{q}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{q}_k$ would then have to satisfy

$$\delta \geq \sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \geq \delta \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\mathbf{q}_i - 1}{k+1}$$

which is equivalent to $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathbf{q}_i \leq 2(k+1)$. Thus $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{q}_0, \mathbf{q}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{q}_k) \in \mathcal{M}$. Similarly, for each $0 \leq i \leq k$, the inequality $1 \geq \|\alpha\|^2 \geq \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2$ holds so that there exists an integer $1 \leq \mathbf{m}_i \leq k+1$ such that

$$\frac{\mathbf{m}_i - 1}{k+1} \leq \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}.$$

As $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq 1$, the integers $\mathbf{m}_i, 0 \leq i \leq k$, satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathbf{m}_i \leq 2(k+1)$ which implies that $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{m}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_k) \in \mathcal{M}$. This completes the proof of (45).

Step III: In this step we find an upper bound of G (in (42)) that depends on the collection $T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$. Using (45), we can bound the quantity G in (42) via

$$G \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sup_{\alpha \in T(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right].$$

Since Z is Gaussian, the first maximum in the right hand side above can be taken outside the expectation up to an additional correction term. We state this as a general result in Lemma B.1. Note that each set $T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ contains the zero vector and also that every vector in $T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ has norm bounded from above by 1. Therefore the quantity D in Lemma B.1 can be taken to be 1 (also take $\sigma = 1$ in Lemma B.1). Lemma B.1 thus gives

$$G \leq \max_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha \in T(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right] + \sqrt{4 \log |\mathcal{M}| + 2 \log |\mathcal{L}|} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

As $|\mathcal{M}| \leq 4^{k+1}$ and, by concavity of the logarithm,

$$\log |\mathcal{L}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} \log n_i \leq (k+1) \log \frac{n}{k+1} \leq (k+1) \log \frac{en}{k+1},$$

we obtain (using also the fact that $\sqrt{2 + 4 \log 4} < 3$) that

$$G \leq \max_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}, \ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha \in T(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right] + 3\sqrt{(k+1) \log \frac{en}{k+1}} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}. \tag{46}$$

We now fix $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and attempt to bound

$$G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha \in T(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle\right]. \tag{47}$$

We write $\langle Z, \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left\langle Z^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)} \right\rangle$ so that $G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ where $G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) := \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\alpha \in T(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \left\langle Z^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)} \right\rangle]$. Let us now fix $0 \leq i \leq k$ and bound $G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$. By the definition of $T(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$,

$$G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) \leq \left[\sup_{\alpha \in T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q},\ell)} \left\langle Z^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)} \right\rangle\right] \tag{48}$$

where

$$T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) := \left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}, \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_i \delta}{k+1}\right\}.$$

Step IV: In this step, we describe how Lemma 3.3 can be used to bound the right hand side in (48). Fix $0 \leq i \leq k$. We do this by rewriting the underlying set $T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ in a form recognizable from Lemma 3.3. For convenience, let

$$\delta_i := \frac{\mathbf{q}_i \delta}{k+1}.$$

We claim that for every $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $\alpha \in T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$, we have

$$V(\Delta(\alpha^{(i)})) \leq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left((\Delta(\alpha^{(i)}))_{n_i - r + 1} - (\Delta(\alpha^{(i)}))_{\ell_i'}\right) + \mathfrak{r}_i\left((\Delta(\alpha^{(i)}))_{\ell_i'} - (\Delta(\alpha^{(i)}))_1\right) + \delta_i \tag{49}$$

where $\Delta(\alpha^{(i)}) := D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(i)}$ and ℓ_i' is related to ℓ_i via

$$\ell_0 := \ell_0' \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_i = j_i + r - 2 + \ell_i' \ \text{ for } \ 1 \leq i \leq k. \tag{50}$$

Before proving (49), let us observe that the expected supremum of $\left\langle Z^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)} \right\rangle$ over all $\alpha^{(i)}$ which satisfy the norm condition $\|\alpha^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{m}_i/(k+1)$ and which satisfy (49) can be controlled directly using Lemma 3.3 (this is done in the next step). The argument for (49) goes as follows. Fix $\alpha \in T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ and observe that, from the definition of $T^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$, we have $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \delta_i$. For $i = 0$, inequality (49) is exactly the same as $\Gamma_0(\alpha, \ell_0) \leq \delta_0$. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, note that

$$(D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(i)})_\ell = (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i + r - 2 + \ell} \qquad \text{for every } 1 \leq \ell \leq n_i - r + 1, \tag{51}$$

which implies that $V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(i)}) = V_{j_i+r-1, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)$ and that

$$V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) \geq V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(i)}) + \mathfrak{r}_i\left((D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i+r-1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i}\right).$$

The notation $V_{a,b}(\cdot)$ may be recalled from (39). The above inequality, together with $\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \delta_i$, allows us to deduce that

$$V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(i)}) \leq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left\{(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_{i+1}-1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i}\right\} + \mathfrak{r}_i\left\{(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i+r-1}\right\} + \delta_i.$$

Using (50) and (51), it is now easy to see that the above inequality is the same as (49). This proves (49).

Step V: Next, we use the characterization in (49) to bound $G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$ using Lemma 3.3. Indeed, we can take $\sigma = 1, t = \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_i/(k+1)} \le 1$, $n = n_i$, $\ell = \ell_i'$ and $\delta = \delta_i$ in Lemma 3.3 to obtain

$$G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) \le C_r \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}} + \delta_i n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \right) \sqrt{\log(en_i)} + C_r \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1} \right)^{(2r-1)/(4r)} n_i^{(2r-1)/(4r)} \delta_i^{1/(2r)}$$

for all $0 \le i \le k$. Here C_r is a constant that depends on r alone. This inequality, together with $G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) \le \sum_{i=0}^k G_i(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)$, gives the following upper bound for $G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)/C_r$:

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} + \sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} + \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_i n_i}{k+1} \right)^{(2r-1)/(4r)} \delta_i^{1/(2r)}. \quad (52)$$

We now bound separately each of the three terms above. For the first term, note that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{m}_i \le 2(k+1)$, we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \le \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^k \log(en_i)} \le \sqrt{2} \sqrt{(k+1) \log \frac{en}{k+1}}$$

where we have also used concavity of the logarithm function to claim that $\sum_{i=0}^k \log(en_i) \le (k+1) \log \frac{en}{k+1}$. For the second term in (52), we write

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \le \max_{0 \le i \le k} \left[n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \right] \sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i \le 2\delta \max_{0 \le i \le k} \left[n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \right]$$

where we have used that $\sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i = \delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{q}_i/(k+1) \le 2\delta$. Assumption (43) now gives

$$\max_{0 \le i \le k} \left[n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \right] \le 2^r \left(\frac{n}{k+1} \right)^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log \frac{en}{k+1}}.$$

We thus obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i n_i^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log(en_i)} \le 2^{1+r} \delta \left(\frac{n}{k+1} \right)^{(2r-1)/2} \sqrt{\log \frac{en}{k+1}}.$$

For the third term in (52), we use Holder's inequality ($\sum_i \alpha_i \beta_i \le (\sum_i \alpha_i^p)^{1/p} (\sum_i \beta_i^q)^{1/q}$ with $p = 2r/(2r-1)$ and $q = 2r$) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_i n_i}{k+1} \right)^{(2r-1)/(4r)} \delta_i^{1/(2r)} &\le \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{m}_i n_i}{k+1}} \right)^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \delta_i \right)^{1/(2r)} \\
&\le 2^{1/(2r)} \delta^{1/(2r)} \left(\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{k+1} \sum_{i=0}^k n_i} \right)^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \\
&\le 2^{(2r+1)/(4r)} \delta^{1/(2r)} n^{(2r-1)/(4r)}
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the second inequality above, we used $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \delta_i \leq 2\delta$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and, in the final inequality, we used $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathbf{m}_i \leq 2(k+1)$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i = n$. Putting the bounds for the three terms in (52) together, we obtain

$$\frac{G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell)}{C_r} \leq \sqrt{2(k+1)\log\frac{en}{k+1}} + 2^{1+r}\delta\left(\frac{n}{k+1}\right)^{(2r-1)/2}\sqrt{\log\frac{en}{k+1}} + 2^{(2r+1)/(4r)}\delta^{1/(2r)}n^{(2r-1)/(4r)} \tag{53}$$

which gives (note also that $\delta \leq C_r\delta_r(\theta)$ by (44))

$$G(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{q}, \ell) \leq c_r\sqrt{n\Delta_r(\theta)},$$

for a suitable constant c_r depending only on r; note that $\sqrt{a}+\sqrt{b}+\sqrt{c} \leq \sqrt{3}\sqrt{a+b+c}$ for $a, b, c > 0$. Combined with (46), this completes the proof of (38) when assumption (43) is true.

Step VI: Now we work with the situation when the assumption (43) is violated. Our basic idea here is that we will add indices to the set of knots $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ to create a new set of indices which contains all the knots of θ and which satisfies an assumption similar to (43). Specifically for every $i \geq 1$ for which n_i is strictly larger than $2n/(k+1)$, we add the indices

$$j_i + \left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor, j_i + 2\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor, \ldots, j_i + A_i\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor$$

to the original set of knots, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer less than or equal to x. Here A_i is the integer part of the ratio of n_i to $\lfloor 2n/(k+1)\rfloor$ and hence

$$A_i \leq n_i\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor^{-1}.$$

Similarly, if $n_0 \geq 2n/(k+1)$, then we add the indices $2-r+\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor, 2-r+2\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor, \ldots, 2-r+A_0\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor$ to the original set of knots $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ where again $A_0 \leq n_0\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor^{-1}$. This construction will create a set of indices $j_1' < \cdots < j_{k'}'$ that contains all the original knots and which satisfy

$$n_i' \leq \frac{2n}{k+1} \qquad \text{for every } i = 0, \ldots, k' \tag{54}$$

where n_i' are defined with respect to $j_1' < \cdots < j_{k'}'$ as $n_0' = j_1' + r - 2$ and $n_i' := j_{i+1}' - j_i'$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k'$. We now note that the number of these new indices, k', satisfies

$$k' \leq k + \sum_{i=0}^{k} A_i \leq k + \left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i = k + n\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor^{-1} \leq 2k+1$$

where we have used $\left\lfloor\frac{2n}{k+1}\right\rfloor \geq \frac{2n}{k+1} - 1 \geq \frac{n}{k+1}$. The inequality $k' \leq 2k+1$, along with (54), implies that

$$n_i' \leq \frac{4n}{k'+1} \qquad \text{for every } i = 0, \ldots, k'. \tag{55}$$

For these indices $j'_1, \ldots, j'_{k'}$, we shall assign signs $\mathfrak{r}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}'_{k'} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ in the following way. If j'_i is a knot (i.e., it is one of $j_1, \ldots, j_k$), then $\mathfrak{r}'_i$ equals the sign of the knot j_i. If j'_i is not a knot, then we assign $\mathfrak{r}'_i$ to be the sign of the nearest knot that is to the right of j'_i (if there is no knot to the right of j'_i, then we take $\mathfrak{r}'_i$ to be zero).

We now go through the previous proof (which was under the case when assumption (43) is satisfied) with the set of indices $j'_1, \ldots, j'_{k'}$ and signs $\mathfrak{r}'_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}'_{k'}$. Instead of (43), we use the inequality (55) which has a slightly worse constant 4 instead of 2. This argument will end with an inequality similar to (53) (but with slightly different constants). Thus we obtain the following upper bound for G:

$$\frac{G^2}{C_r} \leq (k'+1) \log \frac{en}{k'+1} + (\delta')^2 \left(\frac{n}{k'+1} \right)^{2r-1} \log \frac{en}{k'+1} + (\delta')^{1/r} n^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \tag{56}$$

for a constant C_r where

$$\delta' := \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k'} (n'_i)^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}'_i \neq \mathfrak{r}'_{i+1}\} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Now because $k \leq k' \leq 2k+1$, we have $k+1 \leq k'+1 \leq 2(k+1)$ and thus we can replace the k' on the right hand side of (56) by k by enlarging the constant C_r slightly. Finally, to complete the proof, it suffices to observe that because of the construction of the set of indices $j'_1, \ldots, j'_{k'}$ and the choice of the signs, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\delta')^2 &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left[\min \left(n_i, \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{k+1} \right\rfloor \right) \right]^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} n_{i*}^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\} = n_{0*}^{1-2r} + n_{k*}^{1-2r} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n_{i*}^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\} = \delta_r^2(\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

This, along with replacing k' by k in (56), completes the proof of Theorem 2.2. □

3.3. Proofs of Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4

The proof of Corollary 2.3 is almost immediate from Theorem 2.2 and is given first.

Proof of Corollary 2.3. Inequality (16) follows directly from (14) by taking infimum over $V \geq 0$ on both sides of (14).

To prove (17), fix $u > 0$, $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $V_u \geq 0$ be such that

$$\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V_u} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r \sigma^2 \Delta_r(\theta) \right) + u.$$

We then obtain from (15) that

$$\begin{aligned}1 - e^{-x} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_{V_u} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\theta) = V_u}\left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n}\right\}\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_{V_u} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\right) + u + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n}\right\}\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\inf_{V\geq 0}\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}^{(r)}_{V} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \inf_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\right) + u + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The above holds for every $u > 0$ so we can let $u \downarrow 0$ to derive (17). □

We now turn to the proof of Corollary 2.4 which we prove as a consequence of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.1. The following lemma will be needed for this (this lemma is proved in Subsection B.4).

Lemma 3.4. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq r+1$. For every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|D^{(r)}\eta\|_1 = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\theta - \eta\|^2 \leq n^{2r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1^2. \tag{57}$$

Remark 3.2. *When $r = 1$, the inequality in (57) is equivalent to*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_i - \bar{\theta}\right)^2 \leq n\|D\theta\|^2 = nV^2(\theta)$$

which relates the variance of $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n$ to the variation. Therefore Lemma 3.4 can be seen as a relation between variance and variation for general $r \geq 1$.

We are now ready to prove Corollary 2.4.

Proof of Corollary 2.4. Recall from (9) that $V^{(r)}(\theta^*) = n^{r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1$. We first consider the case when $V^{(r)}(\theta^*) > 0$. In this case, we use Lemma 3.4 to claim the existence of $\eta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $V^{(r)}(\eta^*) = 0$ and

$$\|\theta^* - \eta^*\|^2 \leq n^{2r-1}\|D^{(r)}\theta^*\|_1^2 = n\left(V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2. \tag{58}$$

Let now $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as

$$\theta := \eta^* + \frac{V}{V^{(r)}(\theta^*)}\left(\theta^* - \eta^*\right).$$

As $V^{(r)}(\eta^*) = 0$, it follows that $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\alpha) = V}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \alpha\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\alpha)\right\} &\leq \frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \theta\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\|\theta^* - \eta^*\|^2\left(1 - \frac{V}{V^{(r)}(\theta^*)}\right)^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\\ &\leq \left(V - V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\theta)\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality above follows from (58). We now note that, by construction, θ satisfies the minimum length condition (12) with the same constant c because θ^* does so. As a consequence, we have from (13) that

$$\Delta_r(\theta) \leq C_r(c)\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1}$$

where $C_r(c)$ depends on r and c alone and $k = \mathbf{k}_r(\theta) = \mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*)$. We have thus shown that

$$\inf_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^n : V^{(r)}(\alpha)=V}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^*-\alpha\|^2 + C_r\sigma^2\Delta_r(\alpha)\right\} \leq \left(V - V^{(r)}(\theta^*)\right)^2 + C_r(c)\sigma^2\frac{k+1}{n}\log\frac{en}{k+1}.$$

Inequalities (18) and (19) then directly follow from Theorem 2.2.

We now assume that $V^{(r)}(\theta^*) = 0$. Here we have $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta^*) = 1$ so that the second term on the right hand side of (18) becomes $\frac{C_r\sigma^2}{n}\log(en)$. Note also that because $V^{(r)}(\theta^*) = 0$ and $V \geq 0$, we can use Theorem 2.1. To complete the proof, we therefore only need to prove that

$$C_r \max\left(\left(\frac{\sigma^2 V^{1/r}}{n}\right)^{2r/(2r+1)}, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\log(en)\right) \leq V^2 + \frac{C_r^{(2r+1)/(2r)}\sigma^2}{n}\log(en). \tag{59}$$

To prove the above inequality, we may assume that

$$\left(\frac{\sigma^2 V^{1/r}}{n}\right)^{2r/(2r+1)} > C_r^{1/(2r)}\frac{\sigma^2}{n}\log(en)$$

for otherwise (59) is trivial. It is now straightforward to check that the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{n} < \frac{V^2}{(\log en)^{2r+1}}C_r^{-(2r+1)/(2r)}.$$

From here, it is easy to show that

$$C_r\left(\frac{\sigma^2 V^{1/r}}{n}\right)^{2r/(2r+1)} \leq \frac{V^2}{(\log en)^{2r}} \leq V^2$$

which proves (59). This completes the proof of (18) and (19) when $V^{(r)}(\theta^*) = 0$. Inequalities (20) and (21) trivially follow from (18) and (19) respectively. □

3.4. Proof of Theorem 2.5

The proof of Theorem 2.5 is based on the following result which gives a sharp oracle inequality for the risk of penalized estimators in terms of Gaussian mean squared distances to scaled subdifferentials of the penalty function at the parameter values. The non-oracle

formulation of this result comes from Oymak and Hassibi [28, Theorem 3.2]. This sharp oracle version essentially follows from the results of Bellec [2].

For a nonempty set $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, its Gaussian mean squared distance $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C})$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{C}) := \mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}^2(Z,\mathcal{C})\right] \qquad \text{where} \quad \text{dist}(Z,\mathcal{C}) := \inf_{x\in\mathcal{C}} \|Z-x\| \tag{60}$$

and Z is a standard Gaussian vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given data $Y \sim N_n(\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_n)$, consider the following estimator for θ^*:*

$$\hat{\theta}^f_\lambda := \operatorname*{argmin}_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\|Y-\theta\|^2 + \sigma\lambda f(\theta) \right\}.$$

Then the risk $R(\hat{\theta}^f_\lambda, \theta^*)$ of $\hat{\theta}^f_\lambda$ satisfies

$$R(\hat{\theta}^f_\lambda, \theta^*) \le \inf_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^*-\theta\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta)) \right) \tag{61}$$

where $\partial f(\theta)$ denotes the subdifferential of the convex function f at θ and

$$\lambda\partial f(\theta) := \{\lambda v : v \in \partial f(\theta)\}.$$

Also for every $x > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\|\hat{\theta}^f_\lambda - \theta^*\|^2 \le \inf_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n}\|\theta^*-\theta\|^2 + \frac{2\sigma^2}{n}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta)) \right) + \frac{4\sigma^2 x}{n} \tag{62}$$

with probability at least $1-e^{-x}$.

From the above theorem, it is clear that for proving Theorem 2.5 (and Theorem 2.6), we need to bound from above the quantity $\inf_{\lambda\ge 0}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ for $f(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$. Now let

$$\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)) := \cup_{\lambda\ge 0}\lambda\partial f(\theta)$$

and observe that for every $\lambda \ge 0$, the set $\lambda\partial f(\theta)$ is contained in $\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))$. As a direct consequence of inequality (67) below, along with inequality (38), it can be shown that $\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) \le C_r n\Delta_r(\theta)$. A natural idea to control $\inf_{\lambda\ge 0}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ is therefore to relate it to $\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))$. It is trivial to see that $\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) \le \inf_{\lambda\ge 0}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ (because $\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))$ contains $\lambda\partial f(\theta)$ for every θ and $\mathbf{D}(G_1) \le \mathbf{D}(G_2)$ if $G_2 \subseteq G_1$). But this trivial inequality does not help us as we need to bound $\inf_{\lambda\ge 0}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ from above. We therefore need upper bounds for $\inf_{\lambda\ge 0}\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ in terms of $\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))$. Some general results relating these two quantities are available from Foygel and Mackey [10] and we shall use these results in the sequel.

For proving Theorem 2.5, we only need to study the case $r = 1$. Here we use the following result from Foygel and Mackey [10, Proposition 1] which bounds $\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta))$ from above via $\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))$ under a condition on the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$.

Proposition 3.6 (Foygel and Mackey)**.** *Suppose that the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$ satisfies the following property:*

$$\text{there exists } v_0 \in \partial f(\theta) \text{ such that } \langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for every} \quad v \in \partial f(\theta). \tag{63}$$

Then

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))} + 6 \right)^2 + 4. \tag{64}$$

Remark 3.3. *Foygel and Mackey [10, Proposition 1] actually prove that*

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \lambda \partial f(\theta))\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))\right] + 6 \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))} + 6.$$

From here, inequality (64) *follows from the observation that $Z \mapsto \text{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta))$ is 1-Lipschitz (where λ^* minimizes the right hand side above) so that by standard Gaussian concentration*

$$\begin{aligned} Var\left(\text{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta))\right) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left\{ \left| \text{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta)) - \mathbb{E}\left(\text{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta))\right) \right| \geq \sqrt{t} \right\} dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\infty e^{-t/2} dt = 4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{D}(\lambda^* \partial f(\theta)) \leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta))\right]\right)^2 + 4$$

from which (64) *follows.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.5. The basic idea is to realize that condition (63) holds for $f(\theta) := \|D\theta\|_1$ provided $D\theta \neq \mathbf{0}_{n-1}$ (this condition however is not true for $f(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ for $r \geq 2$ which makes the proof of the risk bounds for the penalized estimator for $r \geq 2$ harder).

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We only need to prove inequalities (25) and (26). The remaining two inequalities in the statement of Theorem 2.5 would then follow by taking $\theta = \theta^*$ in the infimum on the right hand side of inequalities (25) and (26) respectively together with the observation that $\Delta_1(\theta) \leq C(c)\frac{k+1}{n} \log \frac{en}{k+1}$ when θ satisfies (12) with constant c.

From Theorem 3.5, it is clear that inequalities (25) and (26) would follow from the inequality:

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq Cn\Delta_1(\theta) \qquad \text{for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{65}$$

It is obvious that proving the above inequality requires determination of the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$ where f denotes the function $f(\alpha) := \|D\alpha\|_1$. Let $j_1 < \cdots < j_k$ denote the first order knots (i.e., jumps) of θ with associated signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$. The subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$ consists precisely of vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 0$ and, for $j = 2, \ldots, n$,

$$\sum_{i=j}^n v_i = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{r}_j & \text{if } j \text{ is a first order knot} \\ \in [-1, 1] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This characterization of the subdifferential follows from the more general result in Proposition 4.4 which describes the subdifferential of $\alpha \mapsto \|D^{(r)}\alpha\|_1$ for every $r \geq 1$.

To prove (65), let us first consider the case when $\|D\theta\|_1 = 0$ i.e., the case when θ is a constant. In this case, it is easy to see from the above expression for $\partial f(\theta)$ that the sets $\lambda\partial f(\theta)$ are increasing as λ increases, and that

$$\cup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \partial f(\theta) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_1 + \cdots + v_n = 0\}$$

These imply that $\mathbf{D}(\lambda\partial f(\theta)) \downarrow n\mathbb{E}\bar{Z}^2 = 1$ as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$. Thus $\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} D(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) = 1$ which implies (65).

We now assume that $\|D\theta\|_1 > 0$. In this case, we shall argue that the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$ satisfies the condition (63). Recall that $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n$ denote the jumps (first order knots) of θ and their signs are $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$. Also let $j_0 = 1$, $j_{k+1} = n+1$, $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$ and $n_0 := j_1 - 1$, $n_i := j_{i+1} - j_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Define the vector $v_0 = (v_{01}, \ldots, v_{0n}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in the following way. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $0 \leq l \leq k$ be the unique integer such that $j_l \leq i < j_{l+1}$. Then we take $v_{0i} := (\mathfrak{r}_l - \mathfrak{r}_{l+1})/n_l$. With this choice of v_0, we shall check below that condition (63) holds. To see this, let $\mathcal{I}_u := \{j_u, \ldots, j_{u+1} - 1\}$ for $u = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle &= \sum_{u=0}^{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_u} \left(v_i - \frac{\mathfrak{r}_u - \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}}{n_u} \right) \left(\frac{\mathfrak{r}_u - \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}}{n_u} \right) \\
&= \sum_{u=0}^{k} \frac{\mathfrak{r}_u - \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}}{n_u} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_u} v_i \right) - \sum_{u=0}^{k} \frac{(\mathfrak{r}_u - \mathfrak{r}_{u+1})^2}{n_u}.
\end{aligned}$$

The quantity above equals zero because, by the characterization of the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$, we have $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_u} v_i = \mathfrak{r}_u - \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}$ for every $v \in \partial f(\theta)$ and $0 \leq u \leq k$. This proves that the condition (63) holds.

We can therefore employ Proposition 3.6 to obtain

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{D}(\mathrm{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))} + 6 \right)^2 + 4. \tag{66}$$

The required bound (65) now follows from (38) as described below. We first note that the polar cone of $\mathrm{cone}(\partial f(\theta))$ equals the tangent cone of the set $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\alpha) \leq f(\theta)\}$ at θ. This is a standard result from convex geometry (see e.g., Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal [16]). When $f(\theta) := \|D\theta\|_1$, note that, in our notation, the set $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\alpha) \leq f(\theta)\}$ is precisely $K^{(1)}(V(\theta))$. Thus, the polar cone to $\mathrm{cone}(\partial f(\theta))$ equals $T_{K^{(1)}(V(\theta))}(\theta)$ (recall the notation of the tangent cone from (37)). From this observation and Amelunxen et al. [1, Proposition 10.1], it follows that

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathrm{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) \leq 1 + \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(1)}(V(\theta))}(\theta) : \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle \right)^2. \tag{67}$$

The above two displayed inequalities, combined with inequality (38) with $r = 1$, imply

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq \left(\sqrt{1 + C_1^2 n \Delta_1(\theta)} + 6 \right)^2 + 4 \leq C n \Delta_1(\theta)$$

for a constant C (here we have also used that $n\Delta_1(\theta) \geq 1$). This proves (65) and completes the proof of Theorem 2.5. □

3.5. Proof of Theorem 2.6

In this subsection, we define $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ to be the function $f(\alpha) := \|D^{(r)}\alpha\|_1$. We shall use Theorem 3.5 as in the case when $r = 1$. However Proposition 3.6 is unfortunately not available as condition (63) is not true for $r \geq 2$.

An understanding of the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta^*)$ is required for proving Theorem 2.6. The next result describes facts about $\partial f(\theta^*)$ that are necessary for the proof.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by $f(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ and let $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

1. *If $D^{(r)}\theta^* \neq \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$, then there exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|v_0\| \geq \frac{(r-1)!}{(r+1)2^{r-1}} n^{-r+1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } v \in \partial f(\theta^*). \tag{68}$$

2. *Suppose that θ^* satisfies the minimum length condition (12) with constant c, then there exists $v^* \in \partial f(\theta^*)$ such that*

$$\|v^*\| \leq C_r c^{-r+1/2} (k+1)^r n^{-r+1/2} \tag{69}$$

where C_r is a constant depending only on r.

Lemma 3.7 is proved in Subsection A.3 using the precise characterization of the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta^*)$ in Proposition 4.4.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. From Theorem 3.5, it is clear that Theorem 2.6 will follow from the inequality

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq C_r(c) \left((\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) + 1) \log \frac{en}{\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) + 1} + (\mathbf{k}_r(\theta) + 1)^{2r} \right) \tag{70}$$

for every $\theta \in \mathcal{M}_r(c)$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.6, it is easy to deal with the case when $D^{(r)}\theta = \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$ by letting $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ which gives $\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) = r$. We therefore assume that $D^{(r)}\theta \neq \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$. For convenience of notation, we denote $\mathbf{k}_r(\theta)$ by k. For (70), let us first argue that it is enough to prove that

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbf{D}(\lambda \partial f(\theta)) \leq \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))} + C_r(c)(k+1)^r \right)^2 + 4 \tag{71}$$

for a constant $C_r(c)$ depending on r and c alone. Before giving the proof of (71), let us first explain how (71) implies (70). To see this, we proceed exactly as towards the end of the proof of Theorem 2.5 (after inequality (66)) to argue that

$$\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) \leq 1 + \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V^{(r)}(\theta))}(\theta): \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \langle Z, \alpha \rangle \right)^2.$$

We then use inequality (38) (and the fact that $n\Delta_r(\theta) \geq 1$) to deduce that

$$\mathbf{D}(\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) \leq C_r n \Delta_r(\theta).$$

Inequality (70) then follows as a consequence of (13). We therefore only need to prove (71). For (71), as described in Remark 3.3, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \lambda \partial f(\theta))\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))\right] + C_r(c)(k+1)^r. \tag{72}$$

To prove (72), we shall use ideas from Foygel and Mackey [10, Proof of Proposition 1]. The basic intuition here is the following. The projection of Z onto $\text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))$ is of course a projection onto $\lambda \partial f(\theta)$ for a random λ. The idea is to show that this random λ concentrates which will connect $\mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \lambda \partial f(\theta))\right]$ to $\mathbb{E}\left[\text{dist}(Z, \text{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))\right]$.

Choose v_0 and v^* as in Lemma 3.7 satisfying (68) and (69) respectively. Let

$$C_r(c) = \frac{(r+1)2^{r+1}}{(r-1)!} c^{-r+\frac{1}{2}} C_r + 1,$$

where C_r is as in inequality (69). Note then that

$$\frac{4\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|} + 2 \leq (C_r(c) - 1)(k+1)^r + 2 \leq C_r(c)(k+1)^r. \tag{73}$$

Define the function $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\lambda(z) := \operatorname*{argmin}_{\lambda \geq 0} \text{dist}(z, \lambda \partial f(\theta)).$$

It follows from Foygel and Mackey [10, Proof of Lemma 3] that $\lambda(z)$ is a $\frac{1}{\|v_0\|}$-Lipschitz function of z (it may be noted that Foygel and Mackey [10, Lemma 3] requires the assumption that $\partial f(\theta)$ satisfies (63) which is not true here for $r \geq 2$. However their proof only requires the assumption that $\langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle = 0$ for all $v \in \partial f(\theta)$ which is true here from (68); the assumption that $v_0 \in \partial f(\theta)$ is not necessary). Because $\lambda(z)$ is $\frac{1}{\|v_0\|}$-Lipschitz, we obtain from standard Gaussian concentration that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2} \qquad \text{where } \mathcal{E} := \left\{ |\lambda(Z) - \mathbb{E}[\lambda(Z)]| < \frac{2}{\|v_0\|} \right\}.$$

Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ holds, and choose $v \in \partial f(\theta)$ such that $\text{dist}(Z, \text{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) = \|Z - \lambda(Z)v\|$. Let

$$\lambda^* := \mathbb{E}[\lambda(Z)] + \frac{2}{\|v_0\|},$$

and note that $\lambda(Z) < \lambda^* < \lambda(Z) + \frac{4}{\|v_0\|}$ on $\mathcal{E}$. By convexity of $\partial f(\theta)$,

$$\frac{\lambda(Z)}{\lambda^*} v + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(Z)}{\lambda^*}\right) v^* \in \partial f(\theta).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dist}\left(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta)\right) &\leq \|Z - (\lambda(Z)v + (\lambda^* - \lambda(Z))v^*)\| \\ &\leq \|Z - \lambda(Z)v\| + (\lambda^* - \lambda(Z))\|v^*\| < \operatorname{dist}(Z, \operatorname{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) + \frac{4\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta)) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(Z, \operatorname{cone}(\partial f(\theta))) < \frac{2\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2}.$$

The above inequality, along with the observation that

$$z \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta)) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(z, \operatorname{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))$$

is a 1-Lipschitz function of z implies, via Foygel and Mackey [10, Lemma 4], that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta)) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(Z, \operatorname{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))\right] &\leq \frac{2\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|} + \sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{1}{1 - 2e^{-2}}\right)} \\ &< \frac{2\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|} + 1,\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\operatorname{dist}(Z, \lambda^* \partial f(\theta))] \leq \mathbb{E}[\operatorname{dist}(Z, \operatorname{cone}(\partial f(\theta)))] + \frac{4\|v^*\|}{\|v_0\|} + 2.$$

This, along with (73), proves (72) which completes the proof of Theorem 2.6. □

4. Some Useful Technical Results

In this section, we highlight some technical results which are needed for the proofs of the key results from Section 3. These results are all proved in Section A and Section B. We believe that these results are useful in their own right and are of independent interest.

4.1. Characterization of the Tangent Cone $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$

Understanding the structure of the tangent cones of the convex set $K^{(r)}(V)$ at vectors $\theta \in K^{(r)}(V)$ is crucial for the proof of Lemma 3.2 which itself is an important ingredient for the proof of Theorem 2.2 (our main risk result for constrained trend filtering). Recall

the definition of $K^{(r)}(V)$ from (6) and the notion of the tangent cone $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ from (37).

The following lemma gives a precise characterization of $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$. Recall the notation $V_{a,b}(\alpha)$ (from (39)) for $1 \le a \le b \le m$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Also recall, from Section 2, the notion of r^{th} order knots (along with their signs) of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 4.1. *Fix $r \ge 1$, $n \ge r+1$ and let $K^{(r)}(V)$ be as in (6). Let $\theta \in K^{(r)}(V)$ be such that $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$.*

(i) Let $2 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_k \le n-r+1$ denote all the r^{th} order knots of θ along with associated signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 1\}$. Then

$$T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) = \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) \le \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left((D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i - 1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i} \right) \right\} \quad (74)$$

with the convention $j_0 = 1$ and $j_{k+1} = n-r+2$.

(ii) Suppose $2 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_k \le n-r+1$ denote any set of indices which contains all the r^{th} order knots of θ. Let $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$ be such that $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is the sign of the knot corresponding to j_i if j_i is a knot and $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is arbitrary in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ if j_i is not a knot. Then

$$T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) \subseteq \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) \le \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left((D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i - 1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i} \right) \right\} \quad (75)$$

where again $j_0 = 1$ and $j_{k+1} = n-r+2$.

Remark 4.1. *Lemma 4.1 only deals with those $\theta \in K^{(r)}(V)$ for which $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that when $V^{(r)}(\theta) < V$, the tangent cone $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta) = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Remark 4.2. *It must be clear from the right hand side of (75) that the tangent cone $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ only depends on the knot indices $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ and the knot signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$. For example, the exact values of θ at $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ are not relevant for the determination of the tangent cone.*

We next state a result on the magnitude of $\min_{1 \le i \le n-r+1} (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_i$ for a vector θ with $\|\theta\| \le 1$. This result, while being of independent interest, also plays a key role for the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 4.2. *Fix $r \ge 1$. There exists a positive constant C_r depending only on r such that for every $n \ge 2r$, $t > 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\theta\| \le t$, there exist indices $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \{1, \ldots, n-r+1\}$ such that*

$$(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{\ell_1} \le C_r n^{(1/2)-r} t \quad \text{and} \quad (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{\ell_2} \ge -C_r n^{(1/2)-r} t. \quad (76)$$

Remark 4.3. *Lemma 4.2 is trivial for $r = 1$ (when it holds with $C_1 = 1$) but the extension to $r \ge 2$ is non-trivial. Also, for general $r \ge 2$, the two indices ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 will be different and it will be incorrect to claim that for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\theta\| \le 1$, there exists a single index $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, n-r+1\}$ for which $|(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_\ell| \le C_r n^{(1/2)-r} t$.*

4.2. A result on Expected Gaussian Suprema

Our key expected Gaussian supremum result is Lemma 3.3 which was crucially used in the proof of Theorem 2.2. In fact, we prove the following more precise result from which Lemma 3.3 easily follows.

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r$, $1 \leq \ell \leq n-r+1$, $t > 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\Delta(\theta) = (\Delta_1(\theta), \ldots, \Delta_{n-r+1}(\theta)) := D^{(r-1)}\theta$. For every $\mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, the quantity*

$$G := \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup\big\{\, \langle \xi, \theta \rangle \;\; : \;\; \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\theta\| \leq t, \text{ and } V(\Delta(\theta)) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell(\theta) - \Delta_1(\theta)) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1}(\theta) - \Delta_\ell(\theta)) + \delta\big\}\Big]$$

is bounded from above as

$$\frac{G}{C_r} \leq \begin{cases} \sigma t^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \delta^{1/(2r)} n^{(2r-1)/(4r)} + \sigma t\sqrt{\log(en)} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 = \mathfrak{r}_2 = 0 \\ \sigma\left\{t^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \ell_1^{(2r-1)/4r} \delta^{1/(2r)} + t\sqrt{\log(e\ell_1)}\right\} + \sigma\left(t + \delta\ell_2^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e\ell_2)} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 = 0, \mathfrak{r}_2 \neq 0 \\ \sigma\left(t + \delta\ell_1^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e\ell_1)} + \sigma\left\{t^{(2r-1)/(2r)} \ell_2^{(2r-1)/4r} \delta^{1/(2r)} + t\sqrt{\log(e\ell_2)}\right\} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 \neq 0, \mathfrak{r}_2 = 0 \\ \sigma\left(t + \delta\ell_1^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e\ell_1)} + \sigma\left(t + \delta\ell_2^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e\ell_2)} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 \neq 0, \mathfrak{r}_2 \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\ell_1 := \ell + r - 1$, $\ell_2 := n - \ell - r + 1$ and C_r is a positive constant depending on r alone.

Remark 4.4. *It is easy to see that Lemma 4.3 implies Lemma 3.3. This is a consquence of the fact that the integers ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 appearing in Lemma 4.3 are both bounded from above by n.*

4.3. Subdifferential of $\theta \mapsto \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$

Understanding the subdifferential of the function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ is crucial for proving risk results of the penalized trend filtering estimator. The following result precisely characterizes the subdifferential of f and is crucial for proving Lemma 3.7.

Proposition 4.4. *Fix $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\partial f(\theta)$ consists of vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$a_j := \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} v_i = 0 \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq r, \tag{77}$$

and

$$a_j := \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} v_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}((D^{(r)}\theta)_{j-r}) & \text{if } (D^{(r)}\theta)_{j-r} \neq 0 \\ \in [-1, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $r < j \leq n$. Here $\operatorname{sgn}(x)$ denotes the sign of x for $x \neq 0$.

4.4. Metric Entropy and Fat Shattering Results

We now state our main metric entropy result which is critical for our expected Gaussian suprema calculations (recall that expected Gaussian suprema can be related to metric entropy via Dudley's entropy bound). The following result might also be of independent interest.

Let us first formally define the notion of metric entropy. For a set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we define $N(\epsilon, K)$ to be the smallest integer m for which there exist points $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

$$\sup_{a \in K} \inf_{1 \le i \le m} \|a - a_i\| \le \epsilon$$

where, as usual, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. The ϵ-metric entropy of K is the logarithm of $N(\epsilon, K)$.

Our main metric entropy result is the following theorem which bounds the metric entropy of the class $S_r(V,t)$ (defined in (34) and also recalled in the theorem below).

Theorem 4.5. *For $r \ge 1$, $t > 0$, $V > 0$ and $n \ge r$, let*

$$S_r(V,t) := \left\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\theta\| \le t, V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) \le V n^{1-r}\right\}.$$

Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\log N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t)) \le C_r \left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/r} + r \log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r t}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right) + C_r \tag{78}$$

for a constant C_r that depends only on r.

As mentioned in Subsection 2.1, the above theorem is proved using existing connections between metric entropy and fat shattering dimension. Let us first recall the notion of fat shattering dimension (see e.g., Pollard [30], Rudelson and Vershynin [31]):

Definition 4.1 (Fat Shattering Dimension)**.** *Let K be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $t \ge 0$, we say that a subset $\{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ is t-shattered by K if there exist real numbers $h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_m}$ such that for every subset $S \subseteq \{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$, there exists a vector $\theta \in K$ for which $\theta_{i_k} \le h_{i_k}$ if $i_k \in S$ and $\theta_{i_k} \ge h_{i_k} + t$ if $i_k \notin S$. The fat shattering dimension of K, denoted by $v(K,t)$ is defined as the maximum cardinality of a set $\{i_1, \ldots, i_m\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ that is t-shattered by K.*

A deep connection between fat shattering dimension and metric entropy is given by the following result due to Rudelson and Vershynin [31, Corollary 6.4] which bounds the metric entropy using the fat shattering dimension.

Theorem 4.6 (Rudelson and Vershynin)**.** *Let K be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that there exists a decreasing function $v : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ and a real number $a > 2$ such that*

$$v(K,s) \le v(s) \quad \text{and} \quad v(as) \le \frac{1}{2} v(s) \quad \text{for all } s > 0. \tag{79}$$

Then there exists a constant C depending on a alone such that

$$\log N(\epsilon, K) \leq Cv\left(\frac{\epsilon}{C\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{80}$$

In the course of proving Theorem 4.5 using the fat shattering dimension, we prove the following result which provides an upper bound on the fat shattering dimension of the class $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ defined in (35). This result might be of independent interest.

Lemma 4.7. *For every $V > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r$ and $t > 0$, we have*

$$v(\mathcal{C}_r(a, V), t) \leq r + \frac{V^{1/r} n^{1-(1/r)}}{t^{1/r}} C_r \tag{81}$$

for a positive constant C_r that depends solely on r.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ryan Tibshirani for informing us about the reference, Steidl et al. [34], and for many other helpful comments.

Appendix A: Proofs for key technical supporting results from the paper

In this section, we prove the key technical supporting results which were used for the proofs of the main results of the paper. In Subsection A.1, we study the tangent cones of $K^{(r)}(V)$ and provide proofs of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.2. Subsection A.2 is devoted to calculations of expected Gaussian suprema and to the proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 4.3. In Subsection A.3, we study the subdifferential of $\theta \mapsto \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ and provide proofs of Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 3.7. Subsection A.4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.5 which is our main metric entropy result.

A.1. Study of the tangent cones $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ and the proof of Lemma 3.2

This section deals with the tangent cone of the convex set $K^{(r)}(V)$ (defined in (6)) at $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. This tangent cone, which was defined in (37), is denoted by $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$. The ultimate goal of this subsection is to prove Lemma 3.2 which was crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.2.

We start by proving Lemma 4.1 which gives a precise characterization of $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$. Recall the notation (39). Also recall, from Section 2, the notion of r^{th} order knots (along with their signs) of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We start with the proof of the first part of the lemma. Let T denote the set on the right hand side of (74). Let us first prove that $T \subseteq T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$. For this, we fix $\alpha \in T$ and argue that $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$, i.e., we show that there exists $c > 0$ such that $\theta + c\alpha \in K^{(r)}(V)$. For $c > 0$, first note that, by the definition of $V(\cdot)$, the variation $v := V(D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))$ can be written as

$$v = \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha)) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left| (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i} - (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i - 1} \right|$$

Because θ has no r^{th} order knots except at $j_1, \ldots, j_k$, first term above can be simplified to obtain

$$v = c \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left| (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i} - (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i - 1} \right|.$$

Now when $c > 0$ is sufficiently small, we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} v &= c \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left\{ (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i} - (D^{(r-1)}(\theta + c\alpha))_{j_i - 1} \right\} \\ &= V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) + c \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left((D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i - 1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq V n^{1-r} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that $\alpha \in T$ and $V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) = V n^{1-r}$. This proves $T \subseteq T_{K^{(r)}(V)}$.

We shall now verify that $T_{K^{(r)}(V)} \subseteq T$. As T is a closed convex cone, it is enough to show that $\alpha - \theta \in T$ for every $\alpha \in K^{(r)}(V)$. For this, as $D^{(r-1)}(\alpha - \theta) = D^{(r-1)}\alpha - D^{(r-1)}\theta$, we need to show that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(D^{(r-1)}(\alpha - \theta)) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left((D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{j_i - 1} \right) \tag{82}$$

is not larger than

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i \left((D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{j_i} - (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{j_i - 1} \right). \tag{83}$$

This is easy because (83) equals $V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) = V n^{1-r}$ and (82) is clearly bounded from above by $V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha) \leq V n^{1-r}$. This proves the first part of the lemma.

The second part is an easy consequence of the first part of the lemma and the following trivial observation. If j_i and j_{i+1} denote two consecutive knots of θ and if j_i' is any integer with $j_i < j_i' < j_{i+1}$, then

$$V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) \geq V_{j_i, j_i' - 1}(\Delta) + V_{j_i', j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) + \mathfrak{r}_i' \left(\Delta_{j_i'} - \Delta_{j_i' - 1} \right)$$

for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathfrak{r}_i' \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ where $\Delta := D^{(r-1)}\alpha$. □

The following corollary to Lemma 4.1 gives a simple sufficient condition for a vector α to belong to $T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$.

Corollary A.1. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and let $K^{(r)}(V)$ be as in (6). Let θ be any point in $K^{(r)}(V)$ for which $V^{(r)}(\theta) = V$. Let $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n - r + 1$ and $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be as in Lemma 4.1(ii). For every $0 \leq i \leq k$, let ℓ_i denote an arbitrary index lying in the set $\{j_i, \ldots, j_{i+1} - 1\}$. Then for every $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$ we have (with the convention that $j_0 = 1$, $j_{k+1} = n - r + 2$, $\mathfrak{r}_0 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$)*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} (\mathfrak{r}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{r}_i)(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i} \tag{84}$$

where

$$\Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) := V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) - \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left(\Delta_{j_{i+1}-1} - \Delta_{\ell_i}\right) - \mathfrak{r}_i\left(\Delta_{\ell_i} - \Delta_{j_i}\right)$$

with $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{n-r+1}) := D^{(r-1)}\alpha$.

Proof of Corollary A.1. Fix $\alpha \in T_{K^{(r)}(V)}(\theta)$. Lemma 4.1 gives that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i\left(\Delta_{j_i - 1} - \Delta_{j_i}\right). \tag{85}$$

Writing

$$V_{j_i, j_{i+1}-1}(\Delta) = \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i) + \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left(\Delta_{j_{i+1}-1} - \Delta_{\ell_i}\right) + \mathfrak{r}_i\left(\Delta_{\ell_i} - \Delta_{j_i}\right)$$

in (85), we deduce that $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(\alpha, \ell_i)$ is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i\left(\Delta_{j_i - 1} - \Delta_{j_i}\right) - \sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\left(\Delta_{j_{i+1}-1} - \Delta_{\ell_i}\right) - \sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathfrak{r}_i\left(\Delta_{\ell_i} - \Delta_{j_i}\right).$$

It is now trivial to check that the expression above equals the right hand side of (84) which completes the proof of Corollary A.1. □

We next show that under the assumption that $\|\alpha\| \leq 1$, the right hand side of (84) can be made to be small by choosing $\ell_0, \ldots, \ell_k$ appropriately. This is the content of the next lemma. Let $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n-r+1$ and $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be as in Lemma 4.1(ii). Also let $j_0 = 1$, $j_{k+1} = n - r + 2$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. The indices $j_0, j_1, \ldots, j_k, j_{k+1}$ can be used to define a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ in the following way: $\mathcal{I}_0 := \{j_0, \ldots, j_1 + r - 2\}$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \{j_i + r - 1, \ldots, j_{i+1} + r - 2\} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Observe that the length of $\mathcal{I}_i$ equals n_i where $n_0 := j_1 + r - 2$ and $n_i = j_{i+1} - j_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Lemma A.2. *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $2 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_k \le n-r+1$ and $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be as in Lemma 4.1(ii). Also let $j_0 = 1$, $j_{k+1} = n - r + 2$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. Further let $\mathcal{I}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_k$ and $n_0, \ldots, n_k$ be as described above. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\alpha\| \le 1$, there exist indices $\ell_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0, \ldots, \ell_k \in \mathcal{I}_k$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} (\mathfrak{r}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{r}_i)(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i} \le C_r \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}} \tag{86}$$

where C_r is a positive constant that depends only on r.

Remark A.1. *The role of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in the above lemma is just to define the j_i's and the $\mathfrak{r}_i$'s as in Lemma 4.1(ii).*

Remark A.2. *The right hand side of* (86) *is obviously always bounded from above by $C_r \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1-2r}\right)^{1/2}$. However, for some special θ, it can be much smaller. For example, if $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ all represent the knots of θ and if $D^{(r-1)}\theta$ is monotone, then the signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k$ are all equal and in that case the right hand side of* (86) *is much smaller and is bounded by $C_r \left(n_0^{1-2r} + n_k^{1-2r}\right)^{1/2}$.*

Proof of Lemma A.2. The proof of Lemma A.2 is crucially reliant on Lemma 4.2 (proved in Section B.3) which essentially says that $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\alpha\| \le t} \min_{1 \le i \le n-r+1} (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_i \le C_r n^{(1/2)-r} t$ for every $t > 0$ and $n \ge r$.

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Define

$$\alpha^{(0)} := (\alpha_{j_0}, \ldots, \alpha_{j_1+r-2})$$

and

$$\alpha^{(u)} := (\alpha_{j_u+r-1}, \ldots, \alpha_{j_{u+1}+r-2}) \qquad \text{for } u = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Note that the vector $\alpha^{(u)}$ has length exactly equal to n_u, for $u = 0, \ldots, k$.

Fix $0 \le u \le k$ and let $t_u := \|\alpha^{(u)}\|$. By Lemma 4.2, there exists an index $\ell'_u \in \{1, \ldots, n_u - r + 1\}$ such that

$$(\mathfrak{r}_{u+1} - \mathfrak{r}_u)(D^{(r-1)}\alpha^{(u)})_{\ell'_u} \le 2C_r n_u^{1/2-r} t_u I\{\mathfrak{r}_u \neq \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}\} \tag{87}$$

for a constant C_r depending on r alone. Taking

$$\ell_0 := \ell'_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_u := j_u + r - 2 + \ell'_u \quad \text{for } 1 \le u \le k,$$

and using the fact that $(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell'_u} = (D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_u}$, we deduce from (87) that

$$(\mathfrak{r}_{u+1} - \mathfrak{r}_u)(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_u} \le 2C_r n_u^{1/2-r} t_u I\{\mathfrak{r}_u \neq \mathfrak{r}_{u+1}\} \qquad \text{for every } u = 0, 1, \ldots, k.$$

The left hand side of (A.2) can therefore be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{k} (\mathfrak{r}_{i+1} - \mathfrak{r}_i)(D^{(r-1)}\alpha)_{\ell_i} &\le 2C_r \sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1/2-r} t_i I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\} \\ &\le 2C_r \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{k} t_i^2} \le 2C_r \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i^{1-2r} I\{\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}\}}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\sum_{i=0}^{k} t_i^2 = \|\alpha\|^2 \leq 1$. □

It is now easy to see that Lemma 3.2 is a consequence of Corollary A.1 and Lemma A.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. The result follows from combining Corollary A.1 and Lemma A.2. □

A.2. Expected Gaussian Suprema Calculations: Proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 4.3

In this section, we shall provide proofs for the Gaussian suprema results: Lemma 3.1 (which was crucially used for the proof of Theorem 2.1) and Lemma 4.3 (which is a stronger version of Lemma 3.3 that was crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.2). We start with the proof of Lemma 3.1 which itself is based on an important metric entropy result (Theorem 4.5; proved in Subsection A.4).

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let G denote the left hand side of (33). We use Dudley's entropy bound to deduce that

$$G \leq C\sigma \int_0^t \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t))}\, d\epsilon$$

where the set $S_r(V,t)$ is defined as $\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\theta\| \leq t, V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) \leq Vn^{1-r}\}$ and $N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t))$ denotes the ϵ-covering number of $S_r(V,t)$ under the Euclidean metric. These covering numbers are bounded in Theorem 4.5 which furnishes a constant C_r such that

$$\sqrt{\log N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t))} \leq C_r \left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/(2r)} + \sqrt{r \log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r t}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)} + C_r \qquad \text{for every } \epsilon > 0$$

where we have also used the elementary inequality $\sqrt{a_1 + a_2 + a_3} \leq \sqrt{a_1} + \sqrt{a_2} + \sqrt{a_3}$ for $a_1, a_2, a_3 \geq 0$. It follows therefore that

$$G \leq C_r\sigma t \left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{t}\right)^{1/(2r)} + C_r\sigma t + C_r\sigma \int_0^t \sqrt{\log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r t}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)} d\epsilon. \tag{88}$$

The last integral above can be controlled in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \sqrt{\log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r t}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)} d\epsilon &= \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}\right)} du \\ &= \int_0^{\sqrt{n}n^{-r}} \sqrt{\log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}\right)} du + \int_{\sqrt{n}n^{-r}}^1 \sqrt{\log\left(2 + \frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}\right)} du.\end{aligned}$$

In the second integral above, we use $u \geq \sqrt{n}n^{-r}$ to argue that the second integral is bounded from above by $\sqrt{\log(2+2^r n^{2r-1})} \leq C_r\sqrt{\log(en)}$. For the first integral, we use

$$\log\left(2+\frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq 1+\frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{2^{r+1}n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}$$

to obtain

$$\int_0^{\sqrt{n}n^{-r}} \sqrt{\log\left(2+\frac{2^r n^r}{u\sqrt{n}}\right)}du \leq C_r.$$

We have therefore proved that

$$G \leq C_r\sigma t\left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{t}\right)^{1/(2r)} + C_r\sigma t\sqrt{\log(en)}$$

for a constant C_r which completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

We now turn to the proof of Lemma 4.3. As described in Remark 4.4, Lemma 4.3 implies Lemma 3.3. Before proceeding to prove Lemma 4.3, we prove an auxiliary result below which will considerably simplify the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Lemma A.3. *For every $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r, t > 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\substack{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n:\|\theta\|\leq t \\ V(D^{(r-1)}\theta)\leq (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{n-r+1}-(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_1+\delta}} \langle\xi,\theta\rangle\right] \leq C_r\sigma\left(t+\delta n^{r-1/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(en)} \tag{89}$$

for a constant C_r that depends on r alone.

Proof of Lemma A.3. We can assume without loss of generality that $t = 1$ (which is ensured by scaling and replacing δ by δ/t). The idea of this proof is to write θ as the difference of two vectors $\alpha(\theta)$ and $\beta(\theta)$ which satisfy $\min_{1\leq i\leq n-r}(D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta))_i \geq 0$ and $\min_{1\leq i\leq n-r}(D^{(r)}\beta(\theta))_i \geq 0$. A recent result from Bellec [2, Theorem 7] will then be used to control the Gaussian suprema over the class of all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfy $\min_{1\leq i\leq n-r}(D^{(r)}\gamma)_i \geq 0$.

To construct the sequences $\alpha(\theta)$ and $\beta(\theta)$, we use Lemma B.2 which gives the following formula for expressing a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in terms of $D^{(r)}\theta$ and $(D^{(i)}\theta)_1$ for $i = 0, \ldots, r-1$:

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-r}\binom{i-j-1}{r-1}(D^{(r)}\theta)_j + \sum_{j=1}^{r}\binom{i-1}{j-1}(D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1$$

where we take the convention that $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ for $b > a$, $\binom{0}{0} = 1$ and that the first term in the right hand side is zero unless $i > r$. Motivated by the above expression, we define $\alpha(\theta) := (\alpha_1(\theta), \ldots, \alpha_n(\theta))$ and $\beta(\theta) := (\beta_1(\theta), \ldots, \beta_n(\theta))$ in the following way:

$$\alpha_i(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^{r}\binom{i-j-1}{r-1}(D^{(r)}\theta)_j^+ + \sum_{j=1}^{r}\binom{i-1}{j-1}(D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1$$

and

$$\beta_i(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} (D^{(r)}\theta)_j^-$$

where $x^+ := \max(x, 0)$ and $x^- := x - x^+$. It is easy then to observe the following: (a) $\theta = \alpha(\theta) - \beta(\theta)$, (b) $(D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta))_i = (D^{(r)}\theta)_i^+$, $(D^{(r)}\beta(\theta))_i = (D^{(r)}\theta)_i^-$, (c) both vectors $\alpha(\theta)$ and $\beta(\theta)$ belong to $S_n^{[r]}$ where

$$S_n^{[r]} := \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n : \min_{1 \le i \le n-r} (D^{(r)}\gamma)_i \ge 0 \right\} = \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n : (D^{(r-1)}\gamma)_1 \le \cdots \le (D^{(r-1)}\gamma)_{n-r+1} \right\},$$

and (d) $(D^{(j-1)}\beta(\theta))_1 = 0$ for $1 \le j \le r$. From these, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) = \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-r} |(D^{(r)}\theta)_i| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-r} (D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta))_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-r} (D^{(r)}\beta(\theta))_i \\ &= (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_{n-r+1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_1 + (D^{(r-1)}\beta(\theta))_{n-r+1} - (D^{(r-1)}\beta(\theta))_1 \\ &= (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_{n-r+1} - (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_1 + (D^{(r-1)}\beta(\theta))_{n-r+1}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above (and the fact that $D^{(r-1)}\theta = D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta) - D^{(r-1)}\beta(\theta)$), it is straightforward to observe that the condition

$$V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) \le (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{n-r+1} - (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_1 + \delta$$

is equivalent to

$$(D^{(r-1)}\beta(\theta))_{n-r+1} \le \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{90}$$

Now for $\beta(\theta) \in S_n^{[r]}$, $(D^{(j-1)}\beta)_1 = 0$ for $1 \le j \le r$, and satisfying (90), we can use Lemma B.2 (with r replaced by $r-1$) to observe that

$$0 \le \beta_i(\theta) \le \frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} = \frac{\delta}{2} \binom{i-1}{r-1} \le \frac{\delta}{2} i^{r-1}$$

where we have used the identity (112). A consequence of the above is that

$$\|\beta(\theta)\|^2 \le \frac{\delta^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{n} i^{2r-2} \le \frac{\delta^2}{4} n^{2r-1}$$

or $\|\beta(\theta)\| \le \delta n^{r-1/2}/2$. Because $\|\theta\| \le 1$, we further deduce that

$$\|\alpha(\theta)\| \le \|\theta\| + \|\beta(\theta)\| \le 1 + \frac{\delta}{2} n^{r-1/2}.$$

Based on these observations, if

$$G := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\substack{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n:\|\theta\|\le t \\ V(D^{(r-1)}\theta)\le (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{n-r+1}-(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_1+\delta}} \langle \xi, \theta\rangle\right],$$

we can write

$$G \le \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha\in S_n^{[r]}:\|\alpha\|\le 1+\delta n^{r-1/2}/2} \langle \xi, \alpha\rangle\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\beta\in S_n^{[r]}:\|\beta\|\le \delta n^{r-1/2}/2} \langle \xi, -\beta\rangle\right].$$

By an elementary scaling property and the fact that ξ and $-\xi$ have the same distribution, we deduce that

$$G \le \left(1+\delta n^{r-1/2}\right)\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha\in S_n^{[r]}:\|\alpha\|\le 1} \langle \xi, \alpha\rangle\right].$$

The right hand side above can be bounded using a recent result from Bellec [2, Theorem 7] which states that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\alpha\in S_n^{[r]}:\|\alpha\|\le 1} \langle \xi, \alpha\rangle\right] \le C_r\sigma\sqrt{\log(en)}$$

for a constant C_r. To be precise, Bellec [2, Theorem 7] proved that the "statistical dimension" of the cone $S_n^{[r]}$ is bounded from above by $C_r^2\log(en)$ for a positive constant C_r^2. See Bellec [2] or Amelunxen et al. [1] for a precise definition of statistical dimension of a convex cone. From here, the above displayed inequality follows from Amelunxen et al. [1, Proposition 10.2] which says that for every cone K, the quantity $\mathbb{E}\sup_{\alpha\in K,\|\alpha\|\le 1}\langle \xi/\sigma, \alpha\rangle$ is bounded from above by the square root of the statistical dimension of K. We therefore have

$$G \le C_r\left(1+\delta n^{r-1/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(en)}.$$

which completes the proof of Lemma A.3. □

We are now ready to prove Lemma 4.3.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. The case when $\mathfrak{r}_1 = \mathfrak{r}_2 = 0$ follows directly from Lemma 3.1 so we assume that at least one of $\mathfrak{r}_1$ and $\mathfrak{r}_2$ is non-zero.

For $\theta\in\mathbb{R}^n$, let $\theta^{(1)} := (\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_{\ell+r-1})$ and $\theta^{(2)} := (\theta_{\ell+r},\ldots,\theta_n)$. We analogously define $\xi^{(1)}$ and $\xi^{(2)}$. Recall that $\Delta\equiv\Delta(\theta) = (\Delta_1(\theta),\ldots,\Delta_{n-r+1}(\theta)) := D^{(r-1)}\theta$. We first claim that under the assumption $V(\Delta)\le \mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell-\Delta_1)+\mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1}-\Delta_\ell)+\delta$, we have

$$V(D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(1)}) = V(\Delta_1,\ldots,\Delta_\ell) \le \mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell-\Delta_1)+\delta \tag{91}$$

and

$$V(D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(2)}) = V(\Delta_{\ell+r},\ldots,\Delta_{n-r+1}) \le \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1}-\Delta_{\ell+r})+\delta. \tag{92}$$

Inequality (91) is a consequence of

$$\mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell - \Delta_1) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1} - \Delta_\ell) + \delta \geq V(\Delta) \geq V(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_\ell) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1} - \Delta_\ell)$$

while (92) is a consequence of

$$\mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell - \Delta_1) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{n-r+1} - \Delta_\ell) + \delta \geq V(\Delta) \geq \mathfrak{r}_1(\Delta_\ell - \Delta_1) + V(\Delta_{\ell+r}, \ldots, \Delta_{n-r+1}) + \mathfrak{r}_2(\Delta_{\ell+r} - \Delta_\ell).$$

From inequalities (91) and (92), and the fact that $\langle \xi, \theta \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left\langle \xi^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)} \right\rangle$, it follows that $G \leq G_1 + G_2$ where

$$G_1 := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup\left\{\left\langle \xi^{(1)}, \theta^{(1)} \right\rangle : \|\theta^{(1)}\| \leq t, V(D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(1)}) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1((D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(1)})_\ell - (D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(1)})_1) + \delta\right\}\right]$$

and

$$G_2 := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup\left\{\left\langle \xi^{(2)}, \theta^{(2)} \right\rangle : \|\theta^{(2)}\| \leq t, V(D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(2)}) \leq \mathfrak{r}_2((D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(2)})_{n-\ell-2r+2} - (D^{(r-1)}\theta^{(2)})_1) + \delta\right\}\right].$$

We now argue that

$$G_1 \leq \begin{cases} C_r\sigma\left\{t^{(2r-1)/(2r)}(\ell+r-1)^{(2r-1)/(4r)}\delta^{1/(2r)} + t\sqrt{\log(e(\ell+r-1))}\right\} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 = 0 \\ C_r\sigma\left(t + \delta(\ell+r-1)^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e(\ell+r-1))} & : \mathfrak{r}_1 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

To see this, note first that when $\mathfrak{r}_1 = 0$, the bound will simply follow from Lemma 3.1. When $\mathfrak{r}_1 = 1$, the bound will follow from Lemma A.3. Finally when $\mathfrak{r}_1 = -1$, we can switch from $\theta^{(1)}$ to $-\theta^{(1)}$ so that the bound will again follow from Lemma A.3.

An identical argument also gives

$$G_2 \leq \begin{cases} C_r\sigma\left\{t^{(2r-1)/(2r)}(n-\ell-r+1)^{(2r-1)/(4r)}\delta^{1/(2r)} + t\sqrt{\log(e(n-\ell-r+1))}\right\} & : \mathfrak{r}_2 = 0 \\ C_r\sigma\left(t + \delta(n-\ell-r+1)^{(2r-1)/2}\right)\sqrt{\log(e(n-\ell-r+1))} & : \mathfrak{r}_2 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

By putting together the above bounds for G_1 and G_2 the proof of Lemma 4.3 is complete. □

A.3. Subdifferential of $\theta \mapsto \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ and proof of Lemma 3.7

This subsection provides a study of the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta)$ where $f(\theta) := \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1$ with an aim to prove Lemma 3.7. We start by proving Proposition 4.4 which gives a precise characterization of the subdifferential.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let us first construct an $n \times n$ matrix M such that for every $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$(M\beta)_i = \begin{cases} (D^{(i-1)}\beta)_1 & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, r \\ (D^{(r)}\beta)_{i-r} & \text{for } i = r+1, \ldots, n. \end{cases}$$

This is of course possible because $\beta \mapsto (D^{(i)}\beta)_j$ is a linear mapping. More specifically, it can be checked that $M = (M_{ij})$ defined by

$$M_{ij} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{i-j}\binom{i-1}{i-j} I\{1 \le j \le i \le n\} & \text{for } 1 \le i \le r, 1 \le j \le n \\ (-1)^{i-j}\binom{r}{i-j} I\{i-r \le j \le i\} & \text{for } r+1 \le i \le n, 1 \le j \le n \end{cases}$$

satisfies the requirement. This is a consequence of the expression:

$$(D^{(r)}\beta)_j = \sum_{k=j}^{j+r} (-1)^{j+r-k} \binom{r}{k-j} \beta_k \qquad \text{for } 1 \le j \le n-r.$$

It is easy to see from the formula for M that it is lower triangular with positive diagonal entries and hence invertible.

Now a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is in $\partial f(\theta)$ if and only if it satisfies

$$f(\theta+\beta) - f(\theta) \ge \langle v, \beta \rangle \qquad \text{for every } \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{93}$$

The left hand side above can be written as

$$f(\theta+\beta) - f(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-r} \left[|(D^{(r)}\theta)_j + (M\beta)_{j+r}| - |(D^{(r)}\theta)_j| \right]. \tag{94}$$

The right hand side in (93) can be written using Lemma B.2 as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \beta \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \beta_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} (D^{(r)}\beta)_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\beta)_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-r} (D^{(r)}\beta)_j \sum_{i=r+j}^{n} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} v_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r} (D^{(j-1)}\beta)_1 \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{i-1}{j-1} v_i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-r} a_{r+j} (M\beta)_{r+j} + \sum_{j=1}^{r} b_j (M\beta)_j \end{aligned}$$

where

$$b_j := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{i-1}{j-1} v_i, \ 1 \le j \le r \quad \text{and} \quad a_{r+j} := \sum_{i=r+j}^{n} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} v_i, \ 1 \le j \le n-r.$$

We now set $\beta = \pm M^{-1}\mathbf{e}_j$ for $1 \le j \le r$, where $\mathbf{e}_j$ is the j'th standard basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, using (94), $f(\theta+\beta) - f(\theta) = 0$, so we must have $\langle v, \beta \rangle = b_j = 0$. Now set $\beta = \lambda M^{-1}\mathbf{e}_{r+j}$ for $1 \le j \le n-r$. If $(D^{(r)}\theta)_j > 0$, then $f(\theta+\beta) - f(\theta) = \lambda$ for

$\lambda \geq -(D^{(r)}\theta)_j$, and $\langle v, \beta \rangle = \lambda a_{r+j}$. In particular, $a_{r+j} \leq 1$ by taking $\lambda > 0$, and $a_{r+j} \geq 1$ by taking $0 > \lambda \geq -(D^{(r)}\theta)_j$, so we must have $a_{r+j} = 1$. Similarly, if $(D^{(r)}\theta)_j < 0$, then we must have $a_{r+j} = -1$. If $(D^{(r)}\theta)_j = 0$, then $f(\theta + \beta) - f(\theta) = |\lambda|$, so we must have $a_{r+j} \in [-1, 1]$. We have thus proved that if $v \in \partial f(\theta)$, then $b_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$ and

$$a_{r+j} = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}((D^{(r)}\theta)_j) & \text{if } (D^{(r)}\theta)_j \neq 0 \\ \in [-1, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq n - r$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if these two conditions are satisfied, then $v \in \partial f(\theta)$. The proof of Lemma 4.4 will then be complete by the observation that $b_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$ is equivalent to $a_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$, where a_j is as defined in (77). To see this, just note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=j}^{r} \binom{r-j}{r-k} b_k &= \sum_{k=j}^{r} \binom{r-j}{r-k} \sum_{i=k}^{n} \binom{i-1}{k-1} v_i = \sum_{i=j}^{n} v_i \sum_{k=j}^{i} \binom{r-j}{r-k} \binom{i-1}{k-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=j}^{n} v_i \sum_{k=1}^{r} \binom{r-j}{r-k} \binom{i-1}{k-1} = \sum_{i=j}^{n} v_i \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} = a_j. \end{aligned}$$

so that $(a_j)_{j=1}^r$ is related to $(b_j)_{j=1}^r$ by a triangular linear system. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.4. □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.7. The proof of the first part of the lemma (inequality (68)) is short while the proof of the second part (inequality (69) is long. We first provide the proof of inequality (68) and then proceed to the proof of inequality (69).

Proof of inequality (68). Fix $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $D^{(r)}\theta^* \neq \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$. Let $\operatorname{aff}(\partial f(\theta^*))$ denote the affine hull of $\partial f(\theta^*)$. We shall take v_0 to be the projection of the zero vector $\mathbf{0}_n$ on $\operatorname{aff}(\partial f(\theta^*))$. It is then easy to see that $\langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle = 0$ for all $v \in \partial f(\theta^*)$. It therefore only remains to prove the lower bound on $\|v_0\|$.

Because $\partial f(\theta^*)$ is given by a finite number of linear inequalities (i.e., it is a polyhedron), its affine hull is given by the intersection of the inequalities which are actually equalities (see, for example, Schrijver [33, Chapter 8]). Therefore, $\operatorname{aff}(\partial f(\theta^*))$ is given by the vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which (77) holds and for which

$$a_j = \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} v_i = \operatorname{sgn}(D^{(r)}\theta^*)$$

for $r < j \leq n$ such that $(D^{(r)}\theta^*)_{j-r} \neq 0$. Let the number of r^{th} order knots of θ^* be k so that the number of equalities in $\operatorname{aff}(\partial f(\theta^*))$ is $k + r$. We can represent these equalities in matrix form as $Bv = b$ where B is $(k+r) \times n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^{k+r}$ with $\|b\|_1 = 1$. Note also that $\max_{i,j} |B_{ij}| \leq \binom{n+r-2}{r-1}$ so that

$$\|B\|_1 := \sup_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Bx\|_1}{\|x\|_1} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^{k+r} |B_{ij}| \leq (k+r) \binom{n+r-2}{r-1} \leq \frac{(r+1)k}{(r-1)!} (2n)^{r-1}.$$

As a result, because the vector v_0 satisfies $Bv_0 = b$, we obtain

$$\|v_0\| \geq \frac{\|v_0\|_1}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{\|b\|_1}{\sqrt{n}\|B\|_1} \geq \frac{k}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{(r+1)k}{(r-1)!}(2n)^{r-1} = \frac{(r-1)!}{(r+1)2^{r-1}} n^{-r+1/2}.$$

This proves (68).

Proof of Inequality (69). Fix $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $2 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leq n-r+1$ be the r^{th} order knots of θ along with associated signs $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_k \in \{-1, 1\}$. Also let $j_0 = 1, j_{k+1} = n-r+2$ and $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathfrak{r}_{k+1} = 0$. It will be convenient below to take $m_i := j_i + r - 1$ for $l = 0, \ldots, k$. Also let $n_0 = j_1 + r - 2$ and $n_i = j_{i+1} - j_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Because it is assumed that the minimum length condition (12) holds for θ^* with constant c, it follows that $n_i \geq cn/(k+1)$ whenever $\mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$.

Let $\mathfrak{g} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth (i.e., C^∞) function such that

1. $\mathfrak{g}(0) = 0$, $\mathfrak{g}(1) = 1$.
2. $\mathfrak{g}^{(j)}(0) = \mathfrak{g}^{(j)}(1) = 0$ for $j \geq 1$.
3. $\mathfrak{g}(t) \in [0, 1]$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.

where $\mathfrak{g}^{(j)}$ is the j^{th} order derivative of $\mathfrak{g}$. For example, the function $\mathfrak{g}(x) := \int_0^x \phi(t)dt$ where

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma \exp\left(\frac{-1}{t(1-t)}\right) & \text{for } t \in (0,1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where γ is chosen so that $\int_0^1 \phi(t)dt = 1$ will satisfy the requirements for $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let us now define a function $S : [1, n+r] \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$S(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \in [1, r] \cup [n+1, n+r] \\ \mathfrak{r}_i \left(1 - \mathfrak{g}\left(\frac{t-m_i}{n_i}\right)\right) + \mathfrak{r}_{i+1} \mathfrak{g}\left(\frac{t-m_i}{n_i}\right) & \text{for } m_i \leq t \leq m_{i+1} \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq k \end{cases}$$

By an abuse of notation, we shall also denote by S, the $n+r$-dimensional vector $(S(1), \ldots, S(n+r))$. It will be clear from the context whether we are referring to the vector S or the function S. From the properties of $\mathfrak{g}$, it is easy to deduce that $S(m_i) = \mathfrak{r}_i$ and $S^{(j)}(m_i) = 0$ for all j and $0 \leq i \leq k+1$. Also $\sup_{t \in [1, n+r]} |S(t)| \leq 1$.

The first key observation is that the vector $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$v_j^* := (-1)^r (D^{(r)} S)_j = \sum_{k=j}^{j+r} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{r}{k-j} S_k \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq n$$

belongs to the subdifferential $\partial f(\theta^*)$. To see this, we need to use Proposition 4.4. Note

that for $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^* := \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} v_i^* &= \sum_{i=j}^{n} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} \sum_{k=i}^{i+r} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{r}{k-i} S_k \\ &= \sum_{k=j}^{n+r} S_k \sum_{i=k-r}^{\min(k,n)} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{r}{k-i} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=j}^{n} S_k \sum_{i=k-r}^{k} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{r}{k-i} \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows because $S_k = 0$ for $k = n+1, \ldots, n+r$. Now let

$$\beta_i := \binom{r+i-j-1}{r-1} \qquad \text{for } i = \ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

where the binomial coefficient is taken to be zero if $r+i-j-1 < r-1$. Then

$$a_j^* = \sum_{k=j}^{n} S_k \sum_{i=k-r}^{k} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{r}{k-i} \beta_i = \sum_{k=j}^{n} S_k (D^{(r)}\beta)_{k-r}.$$

It is now easy to see that β_i is a polynomial in i for $i \geq j+1-r$ which implies that $(D^{(r)}\beta)_{k-r} = 0$ for $k \geq j+1$. It can also be checked that $(D^{(r)}\beta)_{j-r} = 1$. This therefore gives $a_j^* = S_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Proposition 4.4 and the fact that $S_j = S(j) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$, $S(m_i) = \mathfrak{r}_i$ and $|S(t)| \leq 1$ for all t proves that $v^* \in \partial f(\theta^*)$.

We shall now bound $\|v^*\|$ by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^*\|^2 &= \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=m_l-r+1}^{m_l-1} v_j^{*2} + \sum_{l=0}^{k} \sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r} v_j^{*2} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=m_l-r+1}^{m_l-1} ((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 + \sum_{l=0}^{k} \sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r} ((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$M_r := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \mathfrak{g}^{(r)}(t) \right|,$$

and note that

$$\left| S^{(r)}(t) \right| \leq |\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| M_r n_l^{-r} \leq 2 M_r n_{min}^{-r}$$

for $t \in [m_l, m_{l+1}]$ and $0 \leq l \leq k$ where

$$n_{min} := \min_{0 \leq i \leq k : \mathfrak{r}_i \neq \mathfrak{r}_{i+1}} n_i.$$

Then for $m_l - r < j < m_l + r$ and $0 \leq l \leq k+1$ we have

$$|S(j)| \leq \frac{2M_r n_{min}^{-r}}{r!} |j - m_l|^r \leq \frac{2r^r}{r!} M_r n_{min}^{-r} \leq \frac{2e^r}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} M_r n_{min}^{-r}$$

by $(r-1)$-th order Taylor expansion about m_l and Stirling's approximation. (The bound trivially holds if $j < r$ or $j > n$; if $j \notin (m_{l-1}, m_{l+1})$, then the bound holds by expansion about the nearest m_i). Thus for $m_l - r < j < m_l$ and $0 \le l \le k+1$, again by Stirling's approximation, we have

$$|(D^{(r)}S)_j| \le \sum_{i=0}^{r} \binom{r}{i} \frac{2e^r}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} M_r n_{min}^{-r} \le \frac{2^{r+1}e^r}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} M_r n_{min}^{-r}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=m_l-r+1}^{m_l-1} ((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 &\le \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} (r-1) \frac{2^{2r+2}e^{2r}}{2\pi r} M_r^2 n_{min}^{-2r} \\ &\le \frac{2(k+2)}{\pi} (2e)^{2r} M_r^2 n_{min}^{-2r} \le (2e)^{2r} M_r^2 (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r}. \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

We now proceed to the second term for bounding $\|v^*\|$. For this, let

$$N_r = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \mathfrak{g}^{(r+1)}(t) \right|,$$

and note that

$$\left| S^{(r+1)}(t) \right| \le |\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| N_r n_l^{-r-1}.$$

for $t \in [m_l, m_{l+1}]$ and $0 \le l \le k$. Then for $m_l \le j \le m_{l+1} - r$ and $0 \le l \le k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (-1)^r (D^{(r)}S)_j - S^{(r)}(j) \right| &\le \sum_{i=0}^{r} \binom{r}{i} \frac{|\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| N_r n_l^{-r-1}}{(r+1)!} i^{r+1} \le \frac{2^r r^{r+1}}{(r+1)!} |\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| N_r n_l^{-r-1} \\ &\le \frac{2^r e^{r+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi(r+1)}} |\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| N_r n_l^{-r-1} \le \frac{2^{r-1} e^{r+1}}{\sqrt{\pi}} |\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l| N_r n_l^{-r-1}, \end{aligned}$$

by r-th order Taylor expansion about j and Stirling's approximation, using the fact that the r'th order forward difference approximates the r'th derivative up to an error depending on the $(r+1)$'th derivative (i.e. all lower order terms in the Taylor expansion cancel). Then the trivial inequality $|a^2 - b^2| \le (a-b)^2 + 2|b||a-b|$ gives, for

$$T_j := \left| ((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 - \left(S^{(r)}(j) \right)^2 \right|,$$

the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} T_j &\le \left| (-1)^r (D^{(r)}S)_j - S^{(r)}(j) \right|^2 + 2 \left| S^{(r)}(j) \right| \left| (-1)^r (D^{(r)}S)_j - S^{(r)}(j) \right| \\ &\le \frac{2^{2r-2} e^{2r+2}}{\pi} (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 N_r^2 n_l^{-2r-2} + \frac{2^r e^{r+1}}{\sqrt{\pi}} (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 M_r N_r n_l^{-2r-1} \\ &\le (2e)^{2r} (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 (M_r + N_r) N_r n_l^{-2r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

So for $0 \leq l \leq k$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 - \sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}\left(S^{(r)}(j)\right)^2\right| &\leq (n_l - r + 1)(2e)^{2r}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 2M_r + N_r)N_r n_l^{-2r-1} \\ &\leq (2e)^{2r}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2(M_r + N_r)N_r n_l^{-2r} \\ &\leq 4(2e)^{2r}(M_r + N_r)N_r n_{min}^{-2r}.\end{aligned}$$

(the above bound trivially holds if $n_l < r$.) Thus

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k}\sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}((D^{(r)}S)_j)^2 \leq \sum_{l=0}^{k}\sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}\left(S^{(r)}(j)\right)^2 + 4(2e)^{2r}(M_r + N_r)N_r(k+1)n_{min}^{-2r}. \quad (96)$$

Now let

$$K_r = \sup_{t\in[0,1]}\left|\frac{d}{dt}\left(\left(\mathfrak{g}^{(r)}(t)\right)^2\right)\right|,$$

and note that

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}\left(\left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2\right)\right| \leq (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 K_r n_l^{-2r-1}$$

for $t \in [m_l, m_{l+1}]$ and $0 \leq l \leq k$, regarding the derivative as one-sided at the endpoints. Then for $m_l \leq j \leq m_{l+1} - r$ and $0 \leq l \leq k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(S^{(r)}(j)\right)^2 - \int_j^{j+1}\left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt\right| &\leq \int_j^{j+1}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 K_r n_l^{-2r-1}(t-j)dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 K_r n_l^{-2r-1}\end{aligned}$$

by a zeroth order Taylor expansion about j. So for $0 \leq l \leq k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}\left(S^{(r)}(j)\right)^2 - \int_{m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r+1}\left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt\right| &\leq (n_l - r + 1)\frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 K_r n_l^{-2r-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 K_r n_l^{-2r} \leq 2K_r n_{min}^{-2r}.\end{aligned}$$

(The bound trivially holds if $n_l < r$.) Thus

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k}\sum_{j=m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r}\left(S^{(r)}(j)\right)^2 \leq \sum_{l=0}^{k}\int_{m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r+1}\left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt + 2K_r(k+1)n_{min}^{-2r}. \quad (97)$$

Let

$$I_r = \int_0^1\left(\mathfrak{g}^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt,$$

and note that for $0 \leq l \leq k$,

$$\int_{m_l}^{m_{l+1}-r+1} \left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt \leq \int_{m_l}^{m_{l+1}} \left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt = \int_{m_l}^{m_{l+1}} (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 \left(\mathfrak{g}^{(r)}\left(\frac{t-m_l}{n_l}\right)\right)^2 n_l^{-2r} dt$$
$$= (\mathfrak{r}_{l+1} - \mathfrak{r}_l)^2 I_r n_l^{-2r+1} \leq 4 I_r n_{min}^{-2r+1}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k} \int_{m_l}^{j_{m+1}-r+1} \left(S^{(r)}(t)\right)^2 dt \leq 4 I_r (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r+1}. \tag{98}$$

Combining bounds (95), (96), (97), and (98), we have

$$\|v^*\|^2 \leq (2e)^{2r} M_r^2 (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r} + 4(2e)^{2r}(M_r + N_r) N_r (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r} + 2K_r (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r} + 4 I_r (k+1) n_{min}^{-2r+1}$$
$$\leq \left((2e)^{2r}(M_r + 2N_r)^2 + 2K_r + 4I_r\right)(k+1) n_{min}^{-2r+1}.$$

This proves the desired inequality (69) with $C_r = \sqrt{(2e)^{2r}(M_r + 2N_r)^2 + 2K_r + 4I_r}$ (because of the fact that $n_{min} \geq cn/(k+1)$ under assumption (12)). □

A.4. Metric Entropy Result

This section is dedicated to the proof of our main metric entropy result, Theorem 4.5, which is essential for our expected suprema calculations. The following notion will be useful in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Definition A.1. *For $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r$, real numbers $a_0, \ldots, a_{r-1}$ and non-negative real numbers $s_0, \ldots, s_{r-1}$, let $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$ denote the class of all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $a_i \leq (D^{(i)}\theta)_1 \leq a_i + s_i, i = 0, 1, \ldots, r-2$, and*

$$a_{r-1} \leq (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_1 \leq \cdots \leq (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{n-r+1} \leq a_{r-1} + s_{r-1}.$$

The following lemma gives an upper bound on the metric entropy of $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$. This is the most important ingredient for the proof of Theorem 4.5. The proof of this lemma is given in Subsection B.6 and is based on an upper bound on the fat shattering dimension of the classes $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ (proved in Lemma 4.7) together with Theorem 4.6 which relates fat shattering dimension to metric entropy.

Lemma A.4. *For every $\epsilon > 0$, $r \geq 1$, $n \geq r$, $a_0, \ldots, a_{r-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s_0, \ldots, s_{r-1} \geq 0$, we have*

$$\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})) \leq C_r \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\sum_{j=1}^{r} n^{j-1} s_{j-1}}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/r}$$

where C_r is a positive constant that depends on r alone.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.5.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Fix $\delta > 0$ and let

$$K_i := \max\left\{u \geq 0 \text{ integer} : u\delta \leq 2^i t\right\} \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq i < r.$$

It is then clear that $K_i \leq 2^i t/\delta < K_i + 1$ for every $0 \leq i < r$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ denote the class of all vectors $\mathbf{k} := (\mathbf{k}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_{r-1})$ where each $\mathbf{k}_i$ is an integer satisfying $-(K_i + 1) \leq \mathbf{k}_i \leq K_i$. For every $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_{r-1}) \in \mathcal{K}$, let

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k}) := \left\{\theta \in S_r(V,t) : \mathbf{k}_i\delta \leq (D^{(i)}\theta)_1 \leq (\mathbf{k}_i + 1)\delta \text{ for } 0 \leq i < r\right\}.$$

As

$$\left|(D^{(i)}\theta)_1\right| = \left|\sum_{j=1}^{i+1}(-1)^j \binom{i}{j-1}\theta_j\right| \leq \left(\binom{i}{0}^2 + \cdots + \binom{i}{i}^2\right)^{1/2} \|\theta\|$$
$$= \binom{2i}{i}^{1/2} \|\theta\| \leq 2^i\|\theta\| \leq 2^i t$$

for $\theta \in S_r(V,t)$ and $0 \leq i < r$, it follows that $S_r(V,t) \subseteq \cup_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})$. As a result

$$N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t)) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{K}} N(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})) \leq 2^r \prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(K_i + 1) \sup_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{K}} N(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})).$$

Since $K_i \leq 2^i t/\delta \leq 2^{r-1}t/\delta$, we deduce

$$\log N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t)) \leq r \log\left(2 + \frac{2^r t}{\delta}\right) + \sup_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{K}} \log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})). \tag{99}$$

We now bound $\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k}))$ from above for a fixed $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}$. For every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let us define two vectors $\alpha(\theta) := (\alpha_1(\theta), \ldots, \alpha_n(\theta))$ and $\beta(\theta) := (\beta_1(\theta), \ldots, \beta_n(\theta))$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ via

$$\alpha_i(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1}(D^{(r)}\theta)_j^+ + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1}(D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1^+ \tag{100}$$

and

$$\beta_i(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1}(D^{(r)}\theta)_j^- + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1}(D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1^-$$

where $x^+ := \max(x, 0)$ and $x^- = x - x^+$. It then follows from Lemma B.2 that $\theta = \alpha(\theta) - \beta(\theta)$ and, consequently,

$$\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})) \leq \log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k})) + \log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\beta(\mathbf{k})) \tag{101}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) := \{\alpha(\theta) : \theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_\beta(\mathbf{k}) := \{\beta(\theta) : \theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})\}.$$

We now show how to control $\log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}))$ below. The argument for $\log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\beta(\mathbf{k}))$ will be similar. The main idea here (recall the definition of $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$ from Definition A.1) is to note that

$$\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\}) \tag{102}$$

with

$$a_i = \mathbf{k}_i^+ \delta \qquad \text{for } i = 0, \ldots, r-1,$$

and

$$s_i = \delta \quad \text{for } i = 0, \ldots, r-2 \quad \text{and} \quad s_{r-1} = V n^{1-r} + \delta.$$

To see (102), first note that from the definition of $\alpha(\theta)$ in (100), it is straightforward to check that

$$(D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta))_j = (D^{(r)}\theta)_j^+ \qquad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n-r \tag{103}$$

and

$$(D^{(i)}\alpha(\theta))_1 = (D^{(i)}\theta)_1^+ \qquad \text{for } 0 \le i < r. \tag{104}$$

From these identities, it is easy to verify (102) in the following way. Let $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})$ so that $\alpha(\theta) \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k})$. Then $\mathbf{k}_i \delta \le (D^{(i)}\theta)_1 \le (\mathbf{k}_i + 1)\delta$ for $0 \le i < r$. This implies (because the map $x \mapsto x^+$ is non-decreasing and subadditive) via (104) that

$$\mathbf{k}_i^+ \delta \le (D^{(i)}\alpha(\theta))_1 = (D^{(i)}\theta)_1^+ \le \mathbf{k}_i^+ \delta + \delta. \tag{105}$$

Also the identity (103) implies that $D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta) \ge 0$ which, together with (105), means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}_{r-1}^+ \delta \le (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_1 \le \cdots \le (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_{n-r+1} &= V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta)) + (D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta))_1 \\ &\le V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta)) + \mathbf{k}_{r-1}^+ \delta + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

The statement (102) will therefore be proved if we establish that $V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta)) \le V n^{1-r}$. This follows since

$$V(D^{(r-1)}\alpha(\theta)) = \|D^{(r)}\alpha(\theta)\|_1 = \|(D^{(r)}\theta)^+\|_1 \le \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1 = V(D^{(r-1)}\theta) \le V n^{1-r}.$$

This proves (102). We can therefore use Lemma A.4 to bound $\log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}))$ as

$$\log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k})) \le C_r n^{1/(2r)} \left(\frac{\delta n^{r-1} + V}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/r}.$$

Using the elementary inequality $(a+b)^{1/r} \le a^{1/r} + b^{1/r}$, we obtain the simpler inequality

$$\log N(\epsilon/2, \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbf{k})) \le C_r \frac{\delta^{1/r} n^{1-1/2r}}{\epsilon^{1/r}} + C_r \left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/r}. \tag{106}$$

Combining (99), (101) and (106), we obtain

$$\log N(\epsilon, S_r(V,t)) \le r \log\left(2 + \frac{2^r t}{\delta}\right) + C_r \frac{\delta^{1/r} n^{1-1/2r}}{\epsilon^{1/r}} + C_r \left(\frac{V\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/r}.$$

Note that $\delta > 0$ above is arbitrary. Taking $\delta = \epsilon \sqrt{n} n^{-r}$, we obtain (78) which completes the proof of Theorem 4.5. □

Appendix B: Additional technical results and proofs

B.1. A result on Gaussian suprema

Lemma B.1. *Suppose $p, n \geq 1$ and let $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_p$ be subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ each containing the origin and each contained in the closed Euclidean ball of radius D centered at the origin. Then, for $\xi \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1\leq i\leq p}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle\right) \leq \max_{1\leq i\leq p}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + D\sigma\left(\sqrt{2\log p}+\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right). \tag{107}$$

Proof of Lemma B.1. For every $t \geq 0$, by the union bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\leq i\leq p}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle \geq \max_{1\leq i\leq p}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + t\sigma\right\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p}\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle \geq \mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + t\sigma\right\}.$$

Now by hypothesis, every vector in Θ_i has norm bounded by D. As a result, the map $\xi \mapsto \sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle$ is Lipschitz with constant D. By the Gaussian concentration inequality, we deduce therefore that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle \geq \mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + \sigma t\right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right) \qquad \text{for every } 1\leq i\leq p.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{1\leq i\leq p}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle \geq \max_{1\leq i\leq p}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + t\sigma\right\} \leq \min\left\{p\exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right),1\right\}$$

for every $t \geq 0$. Integrating both sides of this inequality from $t = 0$ to $t = \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1\leq i\leq p}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle - \max_{1\leq i\leq p}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle\right)^+ \leq \sigma\int_0^\infty \min\left\{p\exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right),1\right\}dt.$$

The trivial inequality $a \leq b + (a-b)^+$ therefore gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1\leq i\leq p}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle\right) \leq \max_{1\leq i\leq p}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta_i}\langle\xi,\theta\rangle + \sigma\int_0^\infty \min\left\{p\exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right),1\right\}dt.$$

We will now bound the integral from above. For this, we simply write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \min\left\{p\exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right),1\right\}dt &\leq \int_0^{D\sqrt{2\log p}} 1dt + p\int_{D\sqrt{2\log p}}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2D^2}\right)dt \\ &= D\sqrt{2\log p} + \sqrt{2\pi}pD\left(1-\Phi(\sqrt{2\log p})\right).\end{aligned}$$

We now complete the proof of (107) via the Gaussian tail bound $1-\Phi(x) \leq \exp(-x^2/2)/2$ for $x = \sqrt{2\log p}$ (see e.g., Dumbgen [9]). □

B.2. A formula for θ in terms of $D^{(r)}\theta$

Lemma B.2. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq r$. For every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have*

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} (D^{(r)}\theta)_j + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1 \tag{108}$$

where we take the convention that $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ for $b > a$, $\binom{0}{0} = 1$ and that the first term in the right hand side is zero unless $i > r$.

Proof of Lemma B.2. We shall use induction on $r \geq 1$. For $r = 1$, the formula (123) becomes

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (D\theta)_j + \theta_1 \tag{109}$$

which is trivial because $(D\theta)_j = \theta_{j+1} - \theta_j$.

Let us now assume that (123) is true for some $r = \ell \geq 1$ and we shall then prove it for $r = \ell + 1$. Because (123) is true for $r = \ell$, we have

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} (D^{(\ell)}\theta)_j + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1. \tag{110}$$

Inequality (109) for θ replaced by $D^\ell\theta$ gives

$$(D^\ell\theta)_j = (D^\ell\theta)_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (D^{(\ell+1)}\theta)_k.$$

Using the above identity in (110), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_i &= \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} \left((D^\ell\theta)_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (D^{(\ell+1)}\theta)_k \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} (D^{(\ell+1)}\theta)_k + (D^\ell\theta)_1 \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1 \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{i-\ell-1} (D^{(\ell+1)}\theta)_k \sum_{j=k+1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} + (D^\ell\theta)_1 \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

We now use the following elementary identity involving binomial coefficients: For every two integers a and b with $0 \leq b < a$, we have

$$\binom{b}{b} + \binom{b+1}{b} + \cdots + \binom{a}{b} = \binom{a+1}{b+1}. \tag{112}$$

This identity gives

$$\sum_{j=k+1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} = \binom{i-k-1}{\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{i-\ell} \binom{i-j-1}{\ell-1} = \binom{i-1}{\ell}.$$

From the above and (111), we deduce that

$$\theta_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i-\ell-1} (D^{(\ell+1)}\theta)_k \binom{i-k-1}{\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell+1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1$$

which is exactly (123) for $r = \ell + 1$. This completes the proof of Lemma B.2. □

B.3. A result on the magnitude of $\min_{1\le i\le n-r+1}(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_i$ *when* $\|\theta\| \le 1$

This section is devoted to the proof of the Lemma 4.2 which was crucially used in the proof of Lemma A.2.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We only need to prove the first inequality in (76). The second inequality follows by applying the first inequality to $-\theta$.

Via Lemma B.2, we can write the following for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|\theta\| \le t$:

$$t^2 \ge \|\theta\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} s_j + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1 \right)^2$$

where $s_j := (D^{(r)}\theta)_j$ for $= 1, \ldots, n-r$. It follows from here that

$$t^2 \ge \inf_{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} s_j - \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1} \beta_j \right)^2.$$

We now define two matrices. Let X be the $n \times r$ matrix whose $(i,j)^{th}$ entry equals $\binom{i-1}{j-1}$. Let S be the $n \times (n-r)$ matrix whose $(i,j)^{th}$ entry equals $\binom{i-j-1}{r-1}$. Throughout we use the convention that $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ when $a < b$. Also let $s := D^{(r)}\theta = (s_1, \ldots, s_{n-r})^T$ and $\beta := (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r)$. It is then easy to see from the previous inequality that

$$t^2 \ge \inf_{\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r \in \mathbb{R}} \|Ss - X\beta\|^2 = s^T S^T (I - P_X) S s \tag{113}$$

where $P_X = X(X^TX)^{-1}X^T$ is the projection matrix on to the column space of X.

We now need the following two facts about the matrix $A := S^T(I - P_X)S$. These facts (whose proofs are long) are proved in Proposition B.5 and Proposition B.6 respectively.

1. If $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the $n-r$ vector consisting of ones, then $\mathbf{1}^T A \mathbf{1} \ge C_r n^{2r+1}$ for a constant C_r depending on r alone.

2. Every entry of the matrix A is positive.

We shall now complete the proof of Lemma 4.2 assuming the above two facts about the matrix A. Let $\delta := \min_{1\le j\le n-r} s_j$. Our goal is to prove that $\delta \le C_r t n^{-r-1/2}$ so we can assume that $\delta \ge 0$ for otherwise there is nothing to prove. In that case, inequality (113) and the second fact about A together imply

$$t^2 \ge \delta^2 \mathbf{1}^T S^T (I - P_X) S \mathbf{1} = \delta^2 \mathbf{1}^T A \mathbf{1}.$$

The first fact about A then gives $t^2 \ge C_r \delta^2 n^{2r+1}$ and this completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to proving the two facts about the matrix $A := S^T(I - P_X)S$ stated in the proof of Lemma 4.2. These proofs are tedious and long. We adopt the convention that $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{(n)_k}{k!}$ if $k \ge 0$ and 0 otherwise, where $(n)_k$ is the falling factorial, extending the definition of the binomial coefficient to integer arguments. We will make judicious use of the identities $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{n-k}$ and $\binom{n}{k} = (-1)^k \binom{k-n-1}{k}$, as well as the Chu-Vandermonde identity, $\binom{m+n}{r} = \sum_{k=0}^{r} \binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{r-k}$, in its equivalent form $\binom{m+n}{r-s} = \sum_{k=s}^{r} \binom{m}{k-s}\binom{n}{r-k}$.

Recall that X is the $n \times r$ matrix with $X_{ij} = \binom{i-1}{j-1} = \binom{i-1}{i-j}$, S is the $n \times (n-r)$ matrix with $S_{ij} = \binom{i-j-1}{r-1} = \binom{i-j-1}{i-j-r}$ if $i - j \ge r$ and 0 otherwise, and $A = S^T(I - P_X)S$ where P_X is the projection onto the column space of X. Our first step is to compute the inverse of the matrix A explicitly. This is the content of the following Proposition.

Proposition B.3. *Let T be the $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ matrix with $T_{ij} = (-1)^{i-j}\binom{2r}{r+i-j}$. Then $T = A^{-1}$.*

In order to prove Proposition B.3, we need the following lemma.

Lemma B.4. *Let Y be the $r \times (n-r)$ matrix with $Y_{ij} = (-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{r+i-1}{i-j}$, and let U be $n \times (n-r)$ matrix with $U_{ij} = (-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{r}{i-j}$. Then $XY + ST = U$.*

Proof of Lemma B.4. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(XY + ST)_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^{r} X_{ik}Y_{kj} + \sum_{l=1}^{n-r} S_{il}T_{lj} \\
&= \sum_{k=j}^{r} (-1)^{r+k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k}\binom{r+k-1}{k-j} + \sum_{l=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{l-j} \binom{i-l-1}{i-l-r}\binom{2r}{r+l-j} \\
&= (-1)^r \sum_{k=j}^{r} \binom{i-1}{i-k}\binom{-r-j}{k-j} + (-1)^{r+i-j} \sum_{l=1}^{i-r} \binom{-r}{i-l-r}\binom{2r}{r+l-j}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $i < j$, then at least one of $i-k$, $k-j$ is negative, since $(i-k)+(k-j) = i-j < 0$. Hence $(XY)_{ij} = 0$, and similarly $(ST)_{ij} = 0$, so $(XY+ST)_{ij} = 0 = U_{ij}$. Otherwise, there

are three cases. If $j \le i \le r$, then $(ST)_{ij} = 0$ since the sum is empty and

$$(XY)_{ij} = (-1)^r \sum_{k=j}^{i} \binom{i-1}{i-k}\binom{-r-j}{k-j} = (-1)^r \binom{-r+i-j-1}{i-j} = (-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{r}{i-j} = U_{ij}.$$

If $r < j \le i$, then $(XY)_{ij} = 0$ since the sum is empty, and

$$(ST)_{ij} = (-1)^{r+i-j} \sum_{l=j-r}^{i-r} \binom{-r}{i-l-r}\binom{2r}{r+l-j} = (-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{r}{i-j} = U_{ij}.$$

Finally, if $j \le r < i$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(U - XY)_{ij} &= U_{ij} - (-1)^r \sum_{k=j}^{i} \binom{i-1}{i-k}\binom{-r-j}{k-j} + (-1)^r \sum_{k=r+1}^{i} \binom{i-1}{i-k}\binom{-r-j}{k-j} \\
&= (-1)^r \sum_{k=1}^{i-r} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{-r-j}{r+k-j} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{2r+k-1}{r+k-j} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{2r+k-1}{r+j-1} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r} \sum_{l=1}^{r+j} \binom{2r}{r+j-l}\binom{k-1}{l-1} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{i-r} \sum_{l=1}^{k} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{2r}{r+l-j}\binom{k-1}{k-l} \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{i-r} \binom{2r}{r+l-j} \sum_{k=l}^{i-r} (-1)^{k-j} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{k-1}{k-l} \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{l-j} \binom{2r}{r+l-j} \sum_{k=l}^{i-r} \binom{i-1}{i-k-r}\binom{-l}{k-l} \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{i-r} (-1)^{l-j} \binom{2r}{r+l-j}\binom{i-l-1}{i-l-r} = (ST)_{ij}
\end{aligned}$$

where the sixth equality above follows from the fact that $\binom{2r}{r+j-l} = 0$ for $l > r + j$ and $\binom{k-1}{l-1} = 0$ for $l > k$. □

We are now ready to prove Proposition B.3.

Proof of Proposition B.3. Let Y and U be defined as in Lemma B.4. Note that

$$(X^TU)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{ki}U_{kj} = \sum_{k=i}^{r+j}(-1)^{r+k-j}\binom{k-1}{k-i}\binom{r}{r+k-j}$$
$$= (-1)^{r+i-j}\sum_{k=i}^{r+j}\binom{-i}{k-i}\binom{r}{r+j-k}.$$

If $r+j<i$, then $(X^TU)_{ij}=0$ since the sum is empty. Otherwise,

$$(X^TU)_{ij} = (-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{r-i}{r+j-i} = 0$$

since $0 \le r-i < r+j-i$ for $1 \le i \le r$. That is, $X^TU = \mathbf{0}_{r\times(n-r)}$; then each column of U is in $\mathcal{N}(X^T) = \mathcal{C}(X)^\perp$, so $(I-P_X)U = U$. Lemma B.4 gives $(I-P_X)ST = (I-P_X)(U-XY) = U$. Also,

$$(U^TU)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} U_{ki}U_{kj} = (-1)^{i-j}\sum_{k=j}^{r+i}\binom{r}{k-i}\binom{r}{k-j} = (-1)^{i-j}\sum_{k=j}^{r+i}\binom{r}{r+i-k}\binom{r}{k-j}.$$

If $r+i<j$, then $(U^TU)_{ij} = 0 = T_{ij}$ since the sum is empty. Otherwise,

$$(U^TU)_{ij} = (-1)^{i-j}\binom{2r}{r+i-j} = T_{ij}.$$

That is, $U^TU = T$. Then $TAT = TS^T(I-P_X)ST = ((I-P_X)ST)^T(I-P_X)ST = U^TU = T$, and T is invertible since U is lower triangular with full column rank $n-r$ and $\mathrm{rank}(U^TU) = \mathrm{rank}(U)$. Thus $AT = I_{n-r}$, i.e. $T = A^{-1}$. □

We shall now prove the first fact about A in the proof of Lemma 4.2: the bound on $\mathbf{1}^TA\mathbf{1}$. In fact, the result below gives a precise formula for this quantity from which the stated bound trivially follows.

Proposition B.5. $\mathbf{1}_{n-r}^TA\mathbf{1}_{n-r} = \binom{2r}{r}^{-1}\binom{n+r}{2r+1} = \binom{2r}{r}^{-1}\binom{n+r}{n-r-1}$.

Proof of Proposition B.5. Let us first complete the proof of Proposition B.5 assuming that the following claim is true. We shall subsequently give the proof of this claim.

$$A\mathbf{1}_{n-r} = b \tag{114}$$

where b is the $(n-r)$-dimensional vector with $b_i = \binom{2r}{r}^{-1}\binom{n-i}{r}\binom{r+i-1}{r}$.

By (114), for the claimed expression of $\mathbf{1}_{n-r}^TA\mathbf{1}_{n-r}$, it is equivalent to show that $\binom{2r}{r}\mathbf{1}_{n-r}^Tb = \binom{n+r}{n-r-1}$. To see this, write

$$\binom{2r}{r}\mathbf{1}_{n-r}^Tb = \binom{2r}{r}\sum_{i=1}^{n-r}b_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-r}\binom{n-i}{r}\binom{r+i-1}{r} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-r}\binom{n-i}{n-r-i}\binom{r+i-1}{i-1}$$
$$= (-1)^{n-r-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-r}\binom{-r-1}{n-r-i}\binom{-r-1}{i-1} = (-1)^{n-r-1}\binom{-2r-2}{n-r-1} = \binom{n+r}{n-r-1}$$

which proves Proposition B.5 assuming that (114) is true. We shall now prove (114). By Proposition B.3, it is equivalent to show that $\binom{2r}{r}Tb = \binom{2r}{r}\mathbf{1}_{n-r}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{2r}{r}(Tb)_i &= \binom{2r}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{n-r} T_{ij}b_j \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n-r}(-1)^{i-j}\binom{2r}{r+i-j}\binom{n-j}{r}\binom{r+j-1}{r} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n-r}(-1)^{i-j}\binom{2r}{r+j-i}\binom{n-j}{n-r-j}\binom{r+j-1}{r} \\
&= \sum_{j=r+1}^{n}(-1)^{r+i-j}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{n+r-j}{n-j}\binom{j-1}{r} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r+i}\sum_{j=r+1}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{-r-1}{n-j}\binom{j-1}{r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\binom{j-1}{r}$ is a degree r polynomial with leading coefficient $\frac{1}{r!}$ and $((j-i)_k)_{k=0}^r$ is a basis for degree r polynomials, we can write $\binom{j-1}{r} = \sum_{k=0}^r c_k(j-i)_k$ with $c_r = \frac{1}{r!}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{2r}{r}(Tb)_i &= (-1)^{n-r+i}\sum_{j=i}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{-r-1}{n-j}\sum_{k=0}^{r}c_k(j-i)_k \\
&= (-1)^{n-r+i}\sum_{j=i}^{n}\sum_{k=0}^{r}c_k(2r)_k\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r+i}\sum_{k=0}^{r}c_k(2r)_k\sum_{j=i+k}^{n}\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r+i}\sum_{k=0}^{r}c_k(2r)_k\binom{r-k-1}{n-i-k} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r+i}c_r(2r)_r\binom{-1}{n-r-i} = \frac{(2r)_r}{r!}\binom{n-r-i}{n-r-i} = \binom{2r}{r}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the fact that $\binom{2r}{j-i} = 0$ for $j < i$ and $\binom{j-1}{r} = 0$ for $j \le r$. The second equality follows from the identity $\binom{2r}{j-i}(j-i)_k = (2r)_k\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k}$. The third equality follows from the fact that $\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k} = 0$ for $j < i+k$. This completes the proof of (114). □

We now turn to the second claimed fact about A in the proof of Lemma 4.2. This is the content of the following proposition.

Proposition B.6. *Every entry of the matrix A is positive.*

We need the following lemma for the proof of Proposition B.6.

Lemma B.7. *Let x be the $(n-r)$-dimensional vector with $x_i = \binom{n+r-1}{n-1}^{-1}\binom{r+i-2}{r-1}\binom{n-i}{n-r-i}$. Then x is the first column of A.*

Proof of Lemma B.7. By Proposition B.3, it is equivalent to show that $Tx = \mathbf{e}_1$, where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the first standard basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^{n-r}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n+r-1}{n-1}(Tx)_i &= \binom{n+r-1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{n-r} T_{ij}x_j \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n-r}(-1)^{i-j}\binom{2r}{r+i-j}\binom{r+j-2}{r-1}\binom{n-j}{n-r-j} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r-i}\sum_{j=1}^{n-r}\binom{2r}{r+j-i}\binom{r+j-2}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-r-j} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r-i}\sum_{j=r+1}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{j-2}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&= (-1)^{n-r-i}\sum_{j=i}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{j-2}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&\quad - (-1)^{n-r-i}\binom{2r}{1-i}\binom{-1}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-1}\delta_{i1},
\end{aligned}$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. The last equality follows from the fact that $\binom{2r}{j-i} = 0$ for $j < i$ and $\binom{j-2}{r-1} = 0$ for $2 \le j \le r$. Now

$$-(-1)^{n-r-i}\binom{2r}{1-i}\binom{-1}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-1} = (-1)^{i-1}\binom{r-1}{r-1}\binom{n+r-1}{n-1}\delta_{i,1} = \binom{n+r-1}{n-1}\delta_{i,1}.$$

Writing $\binom{j-2}{r-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} c_k(j-i)_k$, similarly to the proof of Proposition B.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=i}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{j-2}{r-1}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} &= \sum_{j=i}^{n}\binom{2r}{j-i}\binom{-r-1}{n-j}\sum_{k=0}^{r-1} c_k(j-i)_k \\
&= \sum_{j=i}^{n}\sum_{k=0}^{r-1} c_k(2r)_k\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} c_k(2r)_k\sum_{j=i+k}^{n}\binom{2r-k}{j-i-k}\binom{-r-1}{n-j} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} c_k(2r)_k\binom{r-k-1}{n-i-k} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The second and third equalities follow from the same reasoning as in the proof of Proposition B.5. The last equality follows from the fact that $0 \le r-k-1 < n-i-k$ for $i \le n-r$. Thus $(Tx)_i = \delta_{i,1}$, i.e. $Tx = \mathbf{e}_1$. □

We are now ready to prove Proposition B.6

Proof of Proposition B.6. Let x be defined as in Lemma B.7. Observe that

$$\frac{x_{k+1}}{x_k} = \frac{r+k-1}{k} \cdot \frac{n-r-k}{n-k}$$

and

$$\frac{x_{n-r-k+1}}{x_{n-r-k}} = \frac{n-k}{n-r-k+1} \cdot \frac{k-1}{r+k-1},$$

so

$$\frac{x_{k+1}}{x_k} \cdot \frac{x_{n-r-k+1}}{x_{n-r-k}} = \frac{k-1}{k} \cdot \frac{n-r-k}{n-r-k+1} < 1.$$

Then for $i \leq \frac{n-r+1}{2}$,

$$\frac{x_{n-r-i+1}}{x_i} = \prod_{k=i}^{n-r-i} \frac{x_{k+1}}{x_k} = \prod_{k=i}^{n-r-i} \frac{x_{n-r-k+1}}{x_{n-r-k}} = \sqrt{\prod_{k=i}^{n-r-i} \frac{x_{k+1}}{x_k} \frac{x_{n-r-k+1}}{x_{n-r-k}}} \leq 1$$

is increasing in i since the number of terms in the product decreases as i increases. Let $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-r$ such that $i+j \leq n-r+1$. If $j \leq \frac{n-r+1}{2}$, then

$$\frac{x_{n-r-i+1}}{x_i} \cdot \frac{x_{n-r-j+1}}{x_j} \leq 1.$$

Otherwise, let $j' = n-r-j+1$, so that $i \leq j' \leq \frac{n-r+1}{2}$. Then

$$\frac{x_{n-r-i+1}}{x_i} \cdot \frac{x_{n-r-j+1}}{x_j} = \frac{x_{n-r-i+1}}{x_i} \cdot \left(\frac{x_{n-r-j'+1}}{x'_j}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{x_{n-r-j'+1}}{x'_j} \cdot \left(\frac{x_{n-r-j'+1}}{x'_j}\right)^{-1} = 1.$$

Thus

$$x_i x_j - x_{n-r-i+1} x_{n-r-j+1} \geq 0.$$

Observe that T is a symmetric Toeplitz matrix. By Lemma B.7, x is the first column of A, so the symmetric Gohberg-Semencul formula (see, for example, Gohberg and Semencul [12]) gives

$$A = \frac{1}{x_1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ x_2 & x_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{n-r} & x_{n-r-1} & \cdots & x_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_{n-r} \\ 0 & x_1 & \cdots & x_{n-r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & x_1 \end{bmatrix} \right.$$
$$\left. - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ x_{n-r} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_2 & \cdots & x_{n-r} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_{n-r} & \cdots & x_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & x_{n-r} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

or

$$A_{ij} = \frac{1}{x_1}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{i} x_k x_{k+j-i} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} x_{n-r-k+1}x_{n-r+i-j-k+1}\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{x_1}\left[x_i x_j + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1}\left(x_k x_{k+j-i} - x_{n-r-k+1}x_{n-r+i-j-k+1}\right)\right].$$

Since T is symmetric Toeplitz, in particular it is symmetric persymmetric; by Proposition B.3, $T = A^{-1}$, so A is symmetric persymmetric as well. It suffices then to consider A_{ij} for $1 \le i \le j \le n-r$ satisfying $i + j \le n - r + 1$. Now $1 \le k \le k + j - i \le n - r$ and $k + (k + j - i) \le n - r + 1$ for $1 \le k \le i - 1$, hence $x_k x_{k+j-i} - x_{n-r-k+1}x_{n-r+i-j-k+1} \ge 0$ and $A_{ij} \ge \frac{x_i x_j}{x_1} > 0$. Thus $A_{ij} > 0$ for all $1 \le i, j \le n - r$ which completes the proof of Proposition B.6. □

B.4. A Result on Variance and Variation (Lemma 3.4)

In this subsection, we provide the proof of Lemma 3.4 which was used in the proof of Corollary 2.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Note that first that for $r = 1$, the result follows by taking $\eta = \bar{\theta}\mathbf{1}_n$ and using the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\theta_i - \bar{\theta}\right)^2 \le n\|D\theta\|_1^2 = nV^2(\theta), \tag{115}$$

which is a consequence of the fact that $|\theta_i - \bar{\theta}| \le \max_{k,l}|\theta_k - \theta_l| \le V(\theta)$ for every $1 \le i \le n$.

Let us therefore assume that $r \ge 2$. We may assume without loss of generality that the vector $D^{(r-1)}\theta$ has mean zero (if not, we will work with $\tilde{\theta}$ instead of θ where $\tilde{\theta}$ is created by subtracting a suitable polynomial sequence of degree $(r-1)$ from θ; this will ensure that $D^{(r-1)}\tilde{\theta}$ has mean zero and that $D^{(r)}\theta = D^{(r)}\tilde{\theta}$). Let X be the $n \times (r-1)$ matrix whose $(i,j)^{th}$ entry equals $\binom{i-1}{j-1}$. Let S be the $n \times (n-r+1)$ matrix whose $(i,j)^{th}$ entry equals $\binom{i-j-1}{r-2}$. Throughout we use the convention that $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ when $a < b$. Let η denote the projection of θ on to the column space of X. We shall prove that the conditions of Lemma 3.4 are satisifed for this choice of η.

Note first that η belongs to the column space of X which implies that the entries η_i of η will be given by a polynomial in i of degree at most $r-2$ so that $D^{(r-1)}\eta = \mathbf{0}_{n-r+1}$. The reader may observe that $D^{(r-1)}\eta = \mathbf{0}_{n-r+1}$ is stronger than the statement of Lemma 3.4 which reads $D^{(r)}\eta = \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$. This is because we have assumed that $D^{(r-1)}\theta$ has mean zero. When this condition is not true, we would need to add a polynomial sequence of degree $(r-1)$ to η so that then $D^{(r-1)}\eta$ will have a constant mean which is same as saying that $D^{(r)}\eta = \mathbf{0}_{n-r}$.

Note from Lemma B.2 that $SD^{(r-1)}\theta$ differs from θ by a polynomial of degree at most $r-2$ so that

$$\theta - \eta = (I - P_X)\theta = (I - P_X)SD^{(r-1)}\theta$$

where P_X is the projection matrix on to the column space of X. As a result

$$\|\theta - \eta\|^2 = \|(I - P_X)SD^{(r-1)}\theta\|^2 \leq \|(I - P_X)S\|^2 \|D^{(r-1)}\theta\|^2$$

where $\|(I-P_X)S\|$ denotes the operator norm of the matrix $(I-P_X)S$. It is clear that the square of the operator norm of $(I-P_X)S$ equals the operator norm of $A := S^T(I-P_X)S$ so that

$$\|\theta - \eta\|^2 \leq \|A\| \|D^{(r-1)}\theta\|^2.$$

Note now that because A is symmetric, its operator norm is bounded by its $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm (see, for example, Golub and Loan [14, Corollary 2.3.2]) defined by

$$\|A\|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n-r+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-r+1} |a_{ij}|$$

and hence we have

$$\|\theta - \eta\|^2 \leq \|A\|_\infty \|D^{(r-1)}\theta\|^2. \tag{116}$$

It may be noted that the matrix A is the same matrix that appeared in the previous section (for example, in Proposition B.6 and Proposition B.5) with r replaced by $r-1$. Therefore because all entries of A are positive (Proposition B.6), we deduce that $\|A\|_\infty = \|A\mathbf{1}_{n-r+1}\|_\infty$ (this latter $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm refers to the usual L_∞ norm for vectors). In the proof of Proposition B.5, we gave a precise expression for $A\mathbf{1}_{n-r+1}$ (see equation (114)). Using this, we deduce that (note that r needs to be replaced by $r-1$ in (114))

$$\|A\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n-r+1} \frac{\binom{n-i}{r-1}\binom{r+i-2}{r-1}}{\binom{2r-2}{r-1}} \leq \frac{n^{2r-2}}{\binom{2r-2}{r-1}} \leq n^{2r-2}.$$

Using the above with inequality (116), we obtain

$$\|\theta - \eta\|^2 \leq n^{2r-2} \|D^{(r-1)}\theta\|^2.$$

To bound the right hand side above further, we use (115) (note that the mean of the vector $D^{(r-1)}\theta$ is taken to be zero) to deduce that

$$\|\theta - \eta\|^2 \leq n^{2r-1} \|D^{(r)}\theta\|_1^2$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

B.5. Proof of the fat shattering bound (Lemma 4.7)

This subsection is devoted to the proof of our fat shattering bound, Lemma 4.7. Recall the notion of fat shattering dimension from Definition 4.1.

For the proof of Lemma 4.7, we shall use the notion of divided differences (see, for example, Kuczma [20, Chapter 15]). For $k \geq 1$, indices $1 \leq \ell_1 < \cdots < \ell_k \leq n$ and real numbers $\alpha_{\ell_1}, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell_k}$, the divided difference $[\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k; \alpha]$ is defined as

$$[\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k; \alpha] := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_{\ell_i}}{\prod_{j \neq i}(\ell_i - \ell_j)}$$

As examples, note that $[\ell_1; \alpha] = \alpha_{\ell_1}$ and $[\ell_1, \ell_2; \alpha] = (\alpha_{\ell_2} - \alpha_{\ell_1})/(\ell_2 - \ell_1)$.

It is easy to verify that the divided differences satisfy the recursive relation

$$[\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k; \alpha] = \frac{[\ell_2, \ldots, \ell_k; \alpha] - [\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{k-1}; \alpha]}{\ell_k - \ell_1}.$$

We shall use the following two facts about divided differences for the proof of Lemma 4.7. The first fact is given in the Lemma B.8 which is a simple consequence of Kuczma [20, Theorem 15.3.1].

Lemma B.8. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq r$. Suppose $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $(D^{(r-1)}\theta)_1 \leq \cdots \leq (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_{n-r+1}$. Then for every choice of indices $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{r+1} \leq n$, we have*

$$[i_2, \ldots, i_{r+1}; \theta] \geq [i_1, \ldots, i_r; \theta].$$

Remark B.1. *When $r = 2$, it is easy to see that Lemma 2.2 reduces to the well-known increasing slopes property of convex sequences.*

The second fact about divided differences is given in Lemma B.9 which is a consequence of Kuczma [20, Lemma 15.2.5 and Theorem 15.2.6].

Lemma B.9. *Fix $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq r$. For every choice of indices $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r \leq n$, there exist non-negative real numbers $\{c_i, 1 \leq i \leq n-r+1\}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1} c_i = 1$ such that*

$$[i_1, \ldots, i_r; \theta] = \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1} c_i (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_i \qquad \text{for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We are now ready to give the proof of Lemma 4.7.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. Fix $t > 0$ and suppose that $S := \{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$ (with $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_m \leq n$) is a subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ that is t-shattered by $\mathcal{C}(V)$. Let $h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_m}$ denote the associated levels and denote by h the vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$ given by $(h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_m})$. We shall then

prove that m is bounded from above by the right hand side of (81). Note that we can assume that $m \geq r$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove).

We first claim that

$$[i_j, i_{j+1}, \ldots, i_{j+r-1}; h] \geq [i_{j-1}, \ldots, i_{j+r-2}; h] + t \sum_{k=j-1}^{j+r-1} (-\tau_{k,j}) \{\tau_{k,j} < 0\} \tag{117}$$

for every $j = 2, \ldots, m-r+1$ where

$$\tau_{k,j} := \prod_{j \leq \ell \leq j+r-1 : \ell \neq k} \frac{1}{i_k - i_\ell} - \prod_{j-1 \leq \ell \leq j+r-2 : \ell \neq k} \frac{1}{i_k - i_\ell}$$

for $k = j, \ldots, j+r-2$ and

$$\tau_{j-1,j} := (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=j}^{j+r-2} \frac{1}{i_\ell - i_{j-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{j+r-1,j} := \prod_{\ell=j}^{j+r-2} \frac{1}{i_{j+r-1} - i_\ell}$$

In the above, for $r = 1$, we take $\tau_{j-1,j} = -1$ and $\tau_{j,j} = 1$.

To see (117), note first that because S is t-shattered by $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$, there exists $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ such that $\theta_{i_k} \leq h_{i_k}$ whenever $\tau_{k,j} \geq 0$ and $\theta_{i_k} \geq h_{i_k} + t$ whenever $\tau_{k,j} < 0$. Because $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$, Lemma B.8 gives

$$[i_j, i_{j+1}, \ldots, i_{j+r-1}; \theta] \geq [i_{j-1}, \ldots, i_{j+r-2}; \theta]$$

It can be checked that the above inequality is equivalent to $\sum_{k=j-1}^{j+r-1} \tau_{k,j} \theta_{i_k} \geq 0$ which is further equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=j-1}^{j+r-1} \tau_{k,j} \theta_{i_k} \{\tau_{k,j} \geq 0\} \geq \sum_{k=j-1}^{j+r-1} (-\tau_{k,j}) \theta_{i_k} \{\tau_{k,j} < 0\}$$

The above inequality, together with the fact that $\theta_{i_k} \leq h_{i_k}$ when $\tau_{k,j} \geq 0$ and $\theta_{i_k} \geq h_{i_k} + t$ when $\tau_{k,j} < 0$, gives (117).

From (117), it is easy that by recursive application, one obtains

$$[i_j, i_{j+1}, \ldots, i_{j+r-1}; h] \geq [i_u, i_{u+1}, \ldots, i_{u+r-1}; h] + t \sum_{a=u}^{j-1} \sum_{k=a}^{a+r} (-\tau_{k,a+1}) \{\tau_{k,a+1} < 0\}$$

for every $1 \leq u < j \leq m-r+1$. Taking $u = 1$ and $j = m-r+1$, we obtain

$$[i_{m-r+1}, \ldots, i_m; h] - [i_1, \ldots, i_r; h] \geq t T_r. \tag{118}$$

where

$$T_r := \sum_{a=1}^{m-r} \sum_{k=a}^{a+r} (-\tau_{k,a+1}) \{\tau_{k,a+1} < 0\}.$$

We now claim that

$$[i_1, \ldots, i_r; h] \geq \frac{a}{(r-1)!} \quad \text{and} \quad [i_{m-r+1}, \ldots, i_m; h] \leq \frac{a+V}{(r-1)!}. \tag{119}$$

We shall prove the first inequality in (119) below. The proof of the second inequality will be similar. One can write $[i_1, \ldots, i_r; h]$ as $\sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j h_{i_j}$ for some real coefficients β_j. Because S is t-shattered by $\mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$, there exists $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$ such that $h_{i_j} \geq \theta_{i_j}$ for $\beta_j \geq 0$ and $h_{i_j} < \theta_{i_j}$ for $\beta_j < 0$. This implies that

$$[i_1, \ldots, i_r; h] = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j h_{i_j} \geq \sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_j \theta_{i_j} = [i_1, \ldots, i_r; \theta].$$

Lemma B.9 now implies that, for some $c_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n-r+1$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1} c_i = 1$, we have

$$[i_1, \ldots, i_r; \theta] = \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{n-r+1} c_i (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_i \geq \frac{a}{(r-1)!}$$

where the last inequality follows because $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(a, V)$. This proves (119).

Combining (119) and (118), we obtain

$$T_r \leq \frac{V}{t(r-1)!}. \tag{120}$$

We now claim the following lower bound for T_r:

$$T_1 = m - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad T_r \geq \frac{(m-r)^r}{n^{r-1}(r-1)^{r-1}} \qquad \text{for every } r \geq 2. \tag{121}$$

Before we prove (121), note first that as a consequence of the above pair of inequalities, inequality (81) holds with $C_1 = 1$ and

$$C_r = \left(\frac{(r-1)^{r-1}}{(r-1)!} \right)^{1/r} \qquad \text{for } r \geq 2.$$

Therefore, to complete the proof of Lemma 4.7, we only need to prove inequality (121).

To prove (121), we assume that $r \geq 2$ (the fact that $T_1 = m - 1$ is obvious) and note first that $\tau_{a+r-1,a+1} < 0$ for every $a = 1, \ldots, m-r$. As a result,

$$T_r \geq \sum_{a=1}^{m-r} (-\tau_{a+r-1,a+1}) \geq \sum_{a=1}^{m-r} \frac{1}{(i_{a+r-1} - i_a) \ldots (i_{a+r-1} - i_{a+r-2})}.$$

By the AM-GM inequality, we have

$$(i_{a+r-1} - i_a) \ldots (i_{a+r-1} - i_{a+r-2}) \leq \left(\frac{(i_{a+r-1} - i_a) + \cdots + (i_{a+r-1} - i_{a+r-2})}{r-1} \right)^{r-1}.$$

If we define $s_j := i_{j+1} - i_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m-1$, then it is easy to see that

$$\frac{(i_{a+r-1} - i_a) + \cdots + (i_{a+r-1} - i_{a+r-2})}{r-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} \frac{j+1}{r-1} s_{a+j} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} s_{a+j}.$$

We have deduced therefore that

$$T_r \geq \sum_{a=1}^{m-r} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{r-2} s_{a+j}} \right)^{r-1}$$

We now use the convexity of the map $x \mapsto (1/x)^{r-1}$ for $x > 0$ to obtain

$$T_r \geq \frac{(m-r)^r}{\left(\sum_{a=1}^{m-r} \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} s_{a+j} \right)^{r-1}}.$$

Inequality (121) follows from here because

$$\sum_{a=1}^{m-r} \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} s_{a+j} = \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} \sum_{a=1}^{m-r} s_{a+j} = \sum_{j=0}^{r-2} (i_{m-r+j+1} - i_{j+1}) \leq n(r-1).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.7. □

B.6. Proof of the metric entropy bound for $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$ (Lemma A.4)

We shall provide the proof Lemma A.4 in this subsection. The proof is based on Lemma 4.7 and Theorem 4.6 which provides an upper bound for the metric entropy in terms of the fat shattering dimension.

Proof of Lemma A.4. It turns out that it is enough to prove the following bound on the fat shattering dimension of $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$:

$$v(\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\}), t) \leq C_r \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} n^{j-1} s_{j-1}}{t} \right)^{1/r}. \tag{122}$$

Indeed, Lemma B.6 is a direct consequence of the above inequality along with Theorem 4.6. To see this, note that if inequality (122) is true, one can simply take the function $v(\cdot)$ in Theorem 4.6 to be

$$v(s) = C_r \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{r} n^{j-1} s_{j-1}}{s} \right)^{1/r}.$$

Then the condition (79) in Theorem 4.6 is true with $a = 2^r$ and Lemma B.6 is therefore a consequence of inequality (80).

The key therefore is to prove (122). For this, note first the identity (which is a consequence of Lemma B.2 applied with $r-1$ instead of r)

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} (D^{(r-1)}\theta)_j + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} (D^{(j-1)}\theta)_1. \tag{123}$$

This identity obviously implies the following lower and upper bounds on θ_i for every $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\})$:

$$\theta_i \geq \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} a_{r-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} a_{j-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_i &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} a_{r-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} a_{j-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} s_{j-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} s_{r-1} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{i-r+1} \binom{i-j-1}{r-2} a_{r-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} a_{j-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{i-1}{j-1} s_{j-1}.\end{aligned}$$

These imply that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\},\{s_i\})} \theta_i - \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\},\{s_i\})} \theta_i \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} \binom{n-1}{j-1} s_{j-1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} n^{j-1} s_{j-1}.$$

As a consequence, it turns out that $v(\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\}), t) = 0$ if $t > \Gamma := \sum_{j=1}^{r} n^{j-1} s_{j-1}$ and hence inequality (122) is trivially true when $t > \Gamma$. We can therefore assume that $t \leq \Gamma$. In this case, because $\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_r(a_{r-1}, s_{r-1})$, Lemma 4.7 gives

$$\begin{aligned}v(\mathcal{C}_r(\{a_i\}, \{s_i\}), t) \leq v(\mathcal{C}_r(a_{r-1}, s_{r-1}), t) &\leq r + C_r \left(\frac{n^{r-1} s_{r-1}}{t}\right)^{1/r} \\ &\leq r \left(\frac{\Gamma}{t}\right)^{1/r} + C_r \left(\frac{\Gamma}{t}\right)^{1/r} = (C_r + r) \left(\frac{\Gamma}{t}\right)^{1/r}\end{aligned}$$

which proves (122) when $t \leq \Gamma$. The completes the proof of Lemma B.6. □

References

[1] Amelunxen, D., M. Lotz, M. B. McCoy, and J. A. Tropp (2014). Living on the edge: Phase transitions in convex programs with random data. *Information and Inference*, iau005.

[2] Bellec, P. C. (2015). Sharp oracle inequalities for least squares estimators in shape restricted regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.08029*.

[3] Breiman, L., J. H. Friedman, R. A. Olshen, and C. J. Stone (1984). *Classification and regression trees*. Wadsworth Statistics/Probability Series. Wadsworth Advanced Books and Software, Belmont, CA.

[4] Brockmann, M., T. Gasser, and E. Herrmann (1993). Locally adaptive bandwidth choice for kernel regression estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 88*(424), 1302–1309.

[5] Chatterjee, S. (2014). A new perspective on least squares under convex constraint. *The Annals of Statistics 42*(6), 2340–2381.

[6] Dalalyan, A., M. Hebiri, and J. Lederer (2017). On the prediction performance of the lasso. *Bernoulli 23*(1), 552–581.

[7] Donoho, D. L. and I. M. Johnstone (1998). Minimax estimation via wavelet shrinkage. *Annals of Statistics 26*(3), 879–921.

[8] Donoho, D. L. and J. M. Johnstone (1994). Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika 81*(3), 425–455.

[9] Dumbgen, L. (2010). Bounding standard gaussian tail probabilities. arxiv preprint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.2063*.

[10] Foygel, R. and L. Mackey (2014). Corrupted sensing: Novel guarantees for separating structured signals. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 60*(2), 1223–1247.

[11] Friedman, J. H. (1991). Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Ann. Statist. 19*(1), 1–141. With discussion and a rejoinder by the author.

[12] Gohberg, I. and A. Semencul (1972). On the inversion of finite toeplitz matrices and their continuous analogs. *Mat. issled 2*, 201–233.

[13] Goldenshluger, A. and A. Nemirovski (1997). On spatially adaptive estimation of nonparametric regression. *Math. Methods Statist. 6*(2), 135–170.

[14] Golub, G. H. and C. F. V. Loan (2013). *Matrix Computations* (Fourth ed.). JHU Press.

[15] Harchaoui, Z. and C. Lévy-Leduc (2012). Multiple change-point estimation with a total variation penalty. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.

[16] Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B. and C. Lemaréchal (2012). *Fundamentals of convex analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[17] Hjort, N. L. and D. Pollard (1993). Asymptotics for minimisers of convex processes. Technical report. available at arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.3806.

[18] Johnstone, I. M. (2015). *Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models*. Available at `http://statweb.stanford.edu/~imj/GE09-08-15.pdf`.

[19] Kim, S.-J., K. Koh, S. Boyd, and D. Gorinevsky (2009). l_1 trend filtering. *SIAM Rev. 51*(2), 339–360.

[20] Kuczma, M. (2009). *An introduction to the theory of functional equations and inequalities: Cauchy's equation and Jensen's inequality*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[21] Laurent, B. and P. Massart (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, 1302–1338.

[22] Lepski, O. V., E. Mammen, and V. G. Spokoiny (1997). Optimal spatial adaptation to inhomogeneous smoothness: an approach based on kernel estimates with variable bandwidth selectors. *Ann. Statist. 25*(3), 929–947.

[23] Lévy-Leduc, C. and Z. Harchaoui (2008). Catching change-points with lasso. In

Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 617–624.

[24] Lin, K., J. Sharpnack, A. Rinaldo, and R. J. Tibshirani (2016). Approximate recovery in changepoint problems, from ℓ_2 estimation error rates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06746*.

[25] Mammen, E. and S. van de Geer (1997). Locally adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics 25*(1), 387–413.

[26] Mangasarian, O. L. and L. L. Schumaker (1971). Discrete splines via mathematical programming. *SIAM Journal on Control 9*(2), 174–183.

[27] Müller, H.-G. and U. Stadtmüller (1987). Variable bandwidth kernel estimators of regression curves. *Ann. Statist. 15*(1), 182–201.

[28] Oymak, S. and B. Hassibi (2013). Sharp mse bounds for proximal denoising. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 1–65.

[29] Pintore, A., P. Speckman, and C. C. Holmes (2006). Spatially adaptive smoothing splines. *Biometrika 93*(1), 113–125.

[30] Pollard, D. (1990). *Empirical Processes: Theory and Applications*, Volume 2 of *NSF-CBMS Regional Conference Series in Probability and Statistics*. Hayward, CA: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

[31] Rudelson, M. and R. Vershynin (2006). Combinatorics of random processes and sections of convex bodies. *Annals of Mathematics*, 603–648.

[32] Rudin, L. I., S. Osher, and E. Fatemi (1992). Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena 60*(1), 259–268.

[33] Schrijver, A. (1986). *Theory of linear and integer programming*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

[34] Steidl, G., S. Didas, and J. Neumann (2006). Splines in higher order tv regularization. *International journal of computer vision 70*(3), 241–255.

[35] Tibshirani, R. J. (2014). Adaptive piecewise polynomial estimation via trend filtering. *The Annals of Statistics 42*(1), 285–323.

[36] Van de Geer, S. (2000). *Applications of Empirical Process Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

[37] van de Geer, S. and M. Wainwright (2015). On concentration for (regularized) empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.00677*.

[38] Van der Vaart, A. and J. A. Wellner (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Process: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer-Verlag.

[39] Wang, Y.-X., A. J. Smola, and R. J. Tibshirani (2014). The falling factorial basis and its statistical applications. In *ICML*, pp. 730–738.

[40] Zhou, S. and X. Shen (2001). Spatially adaptive regression splines and accurate knot selection schemes. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 96*(453), 247–259.